

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, FEBRUARY 8, 1862.

THE Queen's Speech contains only one passage of any peculiar interest to lawyers. Her Majesty commands the commissioners to inform Parliament "that measures for the improvement of the law will be laid before" it, and that "among them will be a Bill for rendering the title to land more simple, and its transfer more easy." No hint is given about the *principle* of the proposed measure—as to whether it is to be a *fac simile* of one of the registration Bills of former Sessions, or is to proceed upon the principle of facilitating the transfer of land, not by interfering with the safety and disposing powers of land-owners, but by simplifying the law of real property. Lord Derby, in his speech upon the address in the House of Lords, expressed his hope that the Government, in dealing with the question of land transfer, would not leave out of sight Sir Hugh Cairns' Bill of 1859 on this subject. That Bill, however, although introduced with a speech of captivating brilliancy, which charmed the landed gentry, was hardly anything else than an attempt to transplant the Irish Landed Estates Court into this country, together with a system of registration of title as opposed to the registration of deeds, but guarded by a contrivance of caveats. The present Lord Chancellor, then a member of the House of Commons, expressed his warm approval of this measure, and, therefore, it is not unlikely that the scheme of the present Government will resemble that of their predecessors. We shall anxiously watch its appearance, and spare no pains or labour to inform our readers of its general bearings, as they may affect the interests of the profession and the public—which in this matter we believe to be identical.

THE Committee of the Mercantile Law Amendment Society have just issued their annual report. It reviews the alterations effected in the Bankruptcy Laws under the Act of last Session, and points out the further amendments in those laws which the committee will seek to obtain. The consolidation of the whole law of bankruptcy and insolvency in one statute, the appointment of a chief judge to preside over the court—advocated principally upon the ground of the imperative necessity of an economical appellate tribunal,—and the administration of the estates of deceased insolvent debtors in the Court of Bankruptcy, instead of, as now, in the Court of Chancery, are considered by the committee as indispensably necessary. They also allege that the arrangement under the Act of last year, giving the collection of book debts under £10 to the official assignee, has been productive of inconvenience and confusion, and suggest that, where a creditors' assignee is appointed to collect debts above that amount, he should also have the collection of those below it; and that when a bankrupt presents a petition for adjudication against himself he should file with such petition a schedule of his debts and estate, as was formerly done by insolvent debtors under the Protection Act, instead of a lapse of more than two months taking place, as is now the case, between the filing of the petition and schedule. They also call attention to the inconvenient form in which the Gazette of bankrupts is arranged, by the indiscriminate mixture of all classes of society in the same Gazette, and they recommend that all trader bankrupts should appear in one list, and non-trader bankrupts in another, both lists being arranged in alphabetical order. The principal portion of the report is, however, devoted to an examination of the law of partnership, especially as regards the unlimited liability of partners, which the committee strongly recommend

should be altered, under certain conditions. They allude to the hardship arising from want of an inexpensive mode of arranging partnership differences, which can now only be done—except by consent—in a court of equity, and they announce their intention to frame a Bill dealing with both the questions.

THE Vice-Chancellor Kindersley sat several days this week to hear adjourned summonses. These sittings were the occasion of much inconvenience to solicitors and members of the Bar who had left town for the recess, relying upon the printed list of sittings after Hillary Term, in which it was intimated that the first day of the sittings of the Court would be on the 7th instant. We understand that there was no further intimation of these sittings than a notice exhibited at the Registrars' Office, which, of course, was not likely to be seen by any who did not happen to have business at the office during the week.

It is announced that Mr. Claydon, a barrister, who has for some time past practised in the county court and petty sessions' courts in the town of Wolverhampton and the district, has been disbarred in the past few days by the benchers of Lincoln's-inn. It is said that he has not unfrequently taken cases without the customary instructions from attorneys, and complaints have been made of this practice to the judge of the county court. During the hearing of an insolvency petition in the Wolverhampton County Court last July, Mr. Claydon publicly announced that he should continue the practice unless it could be shown that he was acting wrongly. The judge (Mr. A. M. Skinner, Q.C.) said that, as a bencher of Lincoln's-inn, he could not but take cognizance of the challenge, and at once drew up a statement of the case, which, if we mistake not, he submitted to Mr. Claydon. This statement having been forwarded to the benchers, they have, after hearing evidence, decided in a manner that, it is announced, will prevent Mr. Claydon from continuing to practise the profession of a barrister. We understand that Mr. Claydon has expressed his resolve to appeal against the decision of the benchers.

MR. DANBY SEYMOUR has made a fierce assault upon the Ecclesiastical Court in a recent letter to the *Times*. He says that nineteen out of every twenty of the judges of these courts are incompetent to perform their duties. He stigmatises the proceedings as "cumbrous, dilatory, and expensive." He states that the fees levied in the registries amount to £49,215 per annum in England and Wales alone—that some are against the statute law, some contrary to the canons of the Church—and that nearly the whole are grossly misapplied. The fees on marriage licenses produce nearly £30,000, and this is a direct tax upon the laity, who have, therefore, a right to inquire into their application, and Mr. Seymour insists that this tax, which is the main support of the Ecclesiastical Courts, ought to be abolished, unless the bishops consent to a sound measure of reform. He further alleges that in some courts there are no tables of fees, and that in one of them the fees have been doubled by mere act of Court, "because the judge thought they were too small." Under these circumstances he proposes that—

1. The Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries in England and Ireland, with their respective judges and officers, shall, during their lives, remain as at present constituted.
2. General rules and orders regulating the procedure and fees of such courts and registries shall be framed, to take effect in each diocese, and to be binding upon all future judges and officers.
3. A Queen's judge shall be appointed for England, and, if it be deemed expedient, another for Ireland, to hear ecclesiastical causes and matters.
4. If the proposed new judge, in England, shall have any surplus time on his hands, it might be stipulated that he should act as assistant-judge in the Divorce Court (especially as the judge in that court is occupied two days every week in considering and hearing mere motions), and should perform such

other duties as the Lord Chancellor may from time to time direct him to discharge.

5. The proposed judge in Ireland shall be made assistant-judge to the Probate Court, and preside in the absence of the judge.

6. The four archbishops shall be empowered, if they deem fit, to send by letters of request all suits of their own, or those sent to them from inferior courts, to be heard before such judges in the most convenient localities.

7. The laity in England shall have, under certain restrictions, the same rights of instituting suits against clerics as the laity in Ireland; and the proposed Queen's judges shall have authority to hear and determine such suits, when sent to them by letters of request from an archbishop.

8. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, with a mixture of English and Irish prelates, shall be the only ultimate appellate tribunal for ecclesiastical causes and matters in England and Ireland.

9. The appeal to the Court of Delegates in Ireland in ecclesiastical causes and matters, the appeal to the Privy Council as now existing in *Duplex querela*, and appeals to the House of Lords in *Quare impedit*, shall be abolished.

Mr. Seymour also strongly urges the consolidation of the ecclesiastical statutes and the abolition of the present ecclesiastical commission.

UNDER the mining laws of British Columbia, which are well adapted to the country, the miners have the power to regulate their own mining affairs, such as settling the size of claims, which must vary in different localities, &c., with the assent and assistance of the Gold Commissioner in each district, and subject to the approval of the Governor. The provisions of the mining laws are very seldom, if ever, complied with in all respects; but still the mining operations are conducted with exemplary propriety, and no body of men, upon the whole, could conduct themselves more peaceably than do the miners of British Columbia. All disputes are submitted to the Commissioner, and if his decision is not acquiesced in, an appeal is taken to the judge of the Supreme Court of Civil Justice (the only one in the whole colony), who goes circuit to all the inhabited parts of the country. The absence of crime generally in British Columbia is noteworthy. The fact is as remarkable, considering the heterogeneous nature of the population, as it is gratifying. It speaks well for the miners, and for the magistrates also, who are a very efficient and respectable body, all young men in the prime of life; and from his character it may be asserted that the moral effect of the free intercourse of the judge (Mr. Justice Begbie, who formerly practised at the equity bar in this country) with all classes, of his disinterested counsel when appealed to extra-judicially—as he frequently is, to settle disputes—and of his urbanity, is very beneficial. The exercise of his good nature prevents litigation, and the fearlessness with which he punishes crime, prevents the commission of heinous offences.

MR. SAMUEL HILL, head of the Rule Department, and one of the officers of the Court of Queen's Bench, has resigned his office. Mr. Hill has served in the Rule Department for nearly fifty years, and during the last twenty-five years has acted as one of the officers of the Court of Queen's Bench. His retirement is deeply regretted by both branches of the profession; and we are informed that the leading members of the Common Law Bar have entered into a subscription for the purpose of presenting Mr. Hill with a substantial token of their esteem.

THE Juridical Society will hold its next meeting on Monday next, at 8 p.m., when Mr. G. Sweet will read a paper on "The expediency of digesting the precedents of the common law and regulating the publication of reports."

MR. CHARLES FLETCHER SKIRROW, of the firm of Messrs. Gregory, Skirrow, & Rowcliffes, has been ap-

pointed Solicitor to the Admiralty in the place of Mr. William Frogatt Robson, deceased.

THE Recordship of Wallingford has become vacant by the death of the late recorder, T. T. Rigby, Esq.

MR. JAMES EDWARD GODDARD BRADFORD, of Swindon, Wilts, has been appointed a Perpetual commissioner for taking the acknowledgments of deeds by married women, for the county of Wilts.

MR. JOHN WATSON, of Nottingham, has been appointed a Perpetual commissioner for taking the acknowledgment of deeds by married women, for the town of Nottingham, and the county of Notts.

ARTISTIC COPYRIGHT.

The law of artistic copyright is in a condition which gives general dissatisfaction, and as the Bill which was presented to Parliament last year is not unlikely to be brought forward again this session, it is desirable to consider its provisions in relation to existing law. It is not long since it was definitively settled—after many conflicting decisions—that there is no copyright at common law in works of art. There are several statutes, however, which deal with the subject; but they are confined to engravings and sculptures, and have the fault not only of excluding many works of art, but also of proceeding upon a principle which sometimes has the effect of working practical injustice. The copyright in any work of art within the provisions of these statutes belongs to the artist unless he has done the work upon a commission, and then it belongs to the person for whom the work was undertaken. It has long been objected by artists that it is unjust thus to confer a copyright upon the purchase of their works merely—without any contract for the purchase of the copyright in them. On the other hand, many of those who give commissions to sculptors and engravers object to any measure which would invest them with a copyright in these commissioned works. We have already mentioned that the existing statutes relate only to engravings and sculptures. Painters are without protection as to the copyright in their pictures. The Bill of last session proposed to give to the author for his life, and thirty years after his death, a copyright in pictures and works of sculpture and engravings made, or for the first time disposed of, after the passing of the Bill. The only condition of copyright was that the name or monogram of the author should be legibly placed upon some conspicuous part of the work. Some persons, however, advocate a system of registration in connection with copyright in such works—similar to that now in force under the Registration of Designs Act. We must expect for some time to come that in every attempted amendment of any important branch of our law somebody will propose the universal panacea of registration. It has been strongly urged in connection with proposed amendments in the law of trade marks, the transfer of land, and many other branches of law besides; but we have from time to time so fully discussed the merits of this nostrum that we shall only now say that in reference to the present subject we are unable to see any good that could possibly be effected by establishing an office for the registration of works of fine art or their designs. In this respect, therefore, we prefer the provision contained in the Bill of last session for the identification of works of art. We have also seen that the Bill proposed to invest the artist with the copyright of all his works, whether executed upon commission or not. It has been suggested that it would be at once more convenient and just that the copyright should become the property of the purchaser—leaving

it open of course to the parties to make any arrangement they please by a special contract. In answer to this suggestion, it may be observed that wherever an Act of Parliament may place the copyright—whether in the artist or the purchaser—it is equally open to them to deal with it by contracting for its transfer from one to another. The only real desideratum is that the right should be based upon a true principle and be intelligible to common sense. It is agreed on all hands that what alone ought to be protected in any work of art is its design. The question is, whether the property not only in the work of art but in its design should, without any express agreement as to the latter, pass to a purchaser? Artists, of course, would answer in the negative. They contend that when they agree for the sale of the work they do not necessarily give up all claim to make further use of its design, and that it would be hard to treat them as guilty of piracy in such a case if they embodied the design more or less in a subsequent work; and we agree with them in this contention. Purchasers, no doubt, regret to find the value of their purchases reduced by such repetition. But it is natural to most authors, whether of works of the intellect or the imagination, to repeat themselves to some extent—and there is no reason why a purchaser of a work of art should be relieved from whatever stipulations in this respect they may think their interests require. After all, the question is to be determined by considerations of convenience, and these appear greatly to preponderate in favour of the artists. Upon the whole, therefore, we are in favour of the provisions of the bill of last session which has the merit of extending protection to painters, of abolishing the present embarrassing distinction between works which have been executed upon commission and those which have not, and of eschewing the establishment of a new registration office which would be both at once entirely useless and very costly.

ON THE LAW OF TRADE MARKS.

No. XII.

(By EDWARD LLOYD, Esq., Barrister-at-law.)

OF COSTS.

I have, in concluding this series of papers, which I fear may have extended to a length which will seem to many to be scarcely warranted by the subject of which they treat, to say a few words only on the question of costs.

The general rule of the court that costs in a suit shall follow the result, and those modifications of that rule which will, under special circumstances, be adopted, are fully laid down by Lord Cottenham in *Milington v. Fox*, 3 My. & Cr. 338. The expediency of the general rule in these cases, as in many others, arises from the consideration that, however doubtful the title may be, or however proper it may be to dispute it, it is but fair that the party who has the right should be reimbursed, as far as giving him the costs of the suit can reimburse him. But there is another object which the Court keeps constantly in view, and which tends to modify the application of this principle—namely, to repress unnecessary litigation, and to keep litigation within those bounds which are essential to enable the parties to vindicate and establish their rights. The case before us affords a good illustration of what are considered by the Court sufficient grounds for admitting this modifying principle. The circumstances which were material as affecting the question of costs were the following. It appeared that an agent of the plaintiffs' had, on the 28th of July, applied to one of the defendants to ascertain whether his firm had been in the habit of using the plaintiffs' trade-mark, and to know what their intention in future was; and had received an evasive answer, or one, at all events, which would justify the plaintiffs in filing their

bill. But on the 2nd of August the defendants wrote to the plaintiffs to disclaim any intention of fraud upon them, stating at the same time that they had given up the use of the mark, and offering to refer the question of compensation for any loss which might have been occasioned to the plaintiffs' trade, to arbitration. By some accident, however, this letter did not reach the plaintiff till the 9th of August, two days after the bill had been filed and the very day upon which the injunction *ex parte* was applied for and obtained. Now, it was clear that on receiving this letter the plaintiffs had got a promise of everything which they were entitled to, and they ought to have been content with this. Instead of that, they prosecuted the suit to a hearing for the sake of the account prayed for by the bill, though, when the cause came on, their counsel was obliged to abandon that part of the prayer. Thus, the whole of the plaintiffs' proceedings subsequently to the receipt of the letter of the 2nd of August had been needless and vexatious, and on this ground the Court, while granting a perpetual injunction, thought that in refusing the plaintiffs the costs of the cause it was only doing what was within its discretion for the purpose of repressing useless litigation.

So also, where any part of the plaintiff's proceedings are, in the opinion of the Court, unnecessary, as in *Pierce v. Franks*, 10 Jur. 23, where the bill contained an allegation to the effect that certain marks used by the defendant were private marks of the plaintiff; but it appeared that these were generally used by the trade as marks of quality. It was indeed contended that the whole suit was vexatious, on the ground that the plaintiff, before filing his bill, ought to have applied to the defendant to obtain the recognition of his right in an amicable manner. But it was held that the plaintiff was entitled to found and establish his right by a suit, the general costs of which were allowed him, excepting such extra costs, if any, as might have been occasioned by the insertion of the allegation which was not true. There would seem to be some conflict of opinion, on comparing these two decisions, for it is clear from the former, that in Lord Cottenham's opinion, if the plaintiffs in that case had received the letter from Messrs. Fox before the filing of their bill, there would have been no necessity for a suit at all, and it is to be presumed costs would have been refused. The Vice-Chancellor, on the other hand, considered that a plaintiff was entitled to his suit and to the protection afforded by an injunction, irrespectively of any concession which might have been made by a defendant. It seems, from this and other cases, a fair conclusion to draw, that the plaintiff is in all cases entitled to the costs of his injunction in the first instance, and that if upon that the defendant submits and agrees to pay all costs up to that time, the plaintiff then has obtained all he can desire, and will be liable himself to the costs of any subsequent proceedings. On the other hand, if the defendant refuses any of those terms to which the plaintiff is entitled, the cause may fairly be brought to a hearing, and the plaintiff will have his costs. Thus in *Burgess v. Hill*, 26 Beav. 244, although the defendant was ignorant of the plaintiffs' rights up to the time of service of the bill, and upon receiving that notice he at once removed the labels, the use of which was complained of, and gave an undertaking not to sell any more of the bottles so labelled, yet upon being served with the injunction and applying to the plaintiffs to stay proceedings he refused to agree to their terms, which were, at first, that he should pay £50, the estimated costs of the proceedings, and afterwards that he should pay taxed costs. In the end, the plaintiffs not being able to arrange any terms, gave notice of motion for a decree. It was held by the Master of the Rolls that the plaintiffs were entitled to apply for and obtain their injunction, and to the costs of all proceedings up to that point, that the defendant by refusing to pay those costs, had placed them in such a position that they had no other course open, but to

bring the matter to a hearing, and that consequently the costs of all the proceedings must be paid by him. So also in *Burgess v. Hatley*, 26 Beav. 249, where the circumstances were very similar to those in the preceding case, the Master of the Rolls thought that the plaintiffs were justified in filing a bill for an injunction without any previous application to the defendant; and his Honour considered that the proper course for him to have taken would have been to acknowledge the plaintiffs' rights, and offer to pay all reasonable costs. But as he did not do this, and drove them to bring the matter to a hearing on the sole question of costs, he, as he had by this course greatly increased the expenses on either side, and refused to give way in a matter in which he had no right to resist, he was adjudged to pay all the costs of the suit. The same course was followed in *The Collins Co. v. Walker*, 7 W. R. 222, where no interlocutory injunction had been applied for, but the cause came to a hearing solely on the question of costs which the defendant had refused to pay. The Vice-Chancellor held that he ought, as soon as he discovered his error, to have offered not only what he did offer,—to give up the use of the mark—but to pay the trifling costs incurred up to that time; but as he had not done so, he would now have to pay all the costs.

When the plaintiff has been sent to a court of law to establish his title, and has succeeded, costs of all the proceedings will be given him on the cause coming on for further consideration, *Farina v. Silverlock*, 4 K. & J. 650. The case of *Rodgers v. Nowill*, 6 Hare, 325, follows the same general rule, though there is in it one peculiarity which deserves notice. The plaintiffs made no interlocutory application, but went into evidence and examined witnesses to prove the allegations of their bill. The Court now considered that this course of proceeding was unjustifiable; that they ought to have applied for leave to try the question of partnership which was in issue, and that it might have dismissed the bill on that ground, and on the ground of the hardship inflicted on a tradesman who is called upon to account for what he has been doing for three or four years during the progress of a suit, and who is subjected to the expense of going into evidence, when it is certain after all that the case must be tried at law. Eventually the plaintiffs succeeded in their action at law, and accordingly a decree was finally made in their favour with all the costs, excepting those of taking the evidence in equity; which, as I have shown, the Court held to be unnecessary. The common practice, and approved of in this case, is to apply for an injunction *ex parte*, and it is suggested that by this course the plaintiff having got the right to try his action at law should not hesitate to do so at once, unless the title to the use of the trade-mark is so clear as to be absolutely indisputable in every case in which the defendant does not at once submit.

The Courts.

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH.

(Sittings at Nisi Prius, before Mr. Justice BLACKBURN and Special Juries.)

Feb. 6.—*Allen v. Clark, Executrix*.—This was an action brought by the plaintiff, one of the ushers of the Court of Exchequer at Guildhall and the Old Bailey, against the executrix of the late Mr. Clark, who was the clerk of arraigns at the Old Bailey, and also a practising attorney, to recover compensation in damages for alleged negligence on the part of the deceased in effecting the purchase for the plaintiff of a house situated at Dalston. The case arose out of the late Hughes frauds, so well known to the profession.

A verdict was ultimately agreed to for the plaintiff, damages £410, subject to the opinion of the Court above on a special case.

COURT OF EXCHEQUER.

(Sittings in Banco, before the LORD CHIEF BARON, and Barons MARTIN, CHANNELL, and WILDE.)

Jan. 31.—*In the matter of Kinder*.—Mr. D. D. Keane showed cause against a rule on behalf of Mr. Kinder, an attorney of this Court, calling upon him to show cause why he should not pay the costs of an action of ejectment, brought against Mr. Goodman, the applicant. It appeared that Mr. Goodman was the yearly tenant of certain lands in Mile-end, holding under a Mrs. Young. The grounds on which the rule had been obtained were that on an action of ejectment being brought against the lessee, the attorney applied against him without the authority of the applicant included him as defendant in the action, whereby he was saddled with the costs amounting to £48 5s. 8d., for which execution had issued and which he had been compelled to pay. The learned counsel said he had the affidavit of Mr. Kinder that he had acted on the instruction of Mrs. Young's son, who had told him he had Mr. Goodman's authority to empower him to act as attorney, and also the affidavit of Young, who swore he had such authority from Goodman, who was too ill to give Mr. Kinder instructions. He apprehended under these circumstances the applicant's remedy was by action, and not by an application to this Court to compel him to pay the costs.

Mr. Lush, in support of the rule, said that Mr. Kinder was bound to have told his client, Mr. Goodman, that as he was a yearly tenant he was not bound to go in and defend the action, as his lessee would have to do so. He thought the Court would follow the course adopted by the Court of Queen's Bench, which had referred a similar case to the Master to ascertain the facts.

Mr. Keane.—My client, my lord, prefers an issue.

Mr. Baron MARTIN.—It will be more expensive.

Mr. Keane.—Still, my lord, he prefers it.

The LORD CHIEF BARON.—Allow me to ask you, Mr. Keane, which would be the more favourable tribunal, the Master or a jury? I do not think I ought to express myself more explicitly, but I should in your case, regarding the *considerata consideranda*, prefer the Master.

Mr. Keane.—I so appreciate your lordship's suggestion that I will on the part of my client adopt it and go to the Master.

Mr. Lush.—I am quite ready to go to the Master. We only want the truth to be elicited.

The matter was accordingly referred to the Master.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

(Before Mr. Commissioner HOLROYD.)

Jan. 30.—*In re Dell*.—This bankrupt had traded in Southwark-bridge-road as a boot maker. A few days since he applied, under the 160th section of the new Act, for an order of discharge.

Mr. Albert Turner (Sole, Turner, & Turner), for the assignees, and Mr. C. E. Lewis (Harrison & Lewis) for the bankrupt.

The COMMISSIONER now gave judgment.—The certificate of the bankrupt was refused in 1857 by Mr. Commissioner Evans. An appeal was presented, but the decision of the commissioner was confirmed. Three years having elapsed since the refusal of the certificate, the bankrupt applied under the new Act for an order of discharge. The charges against the bankrupt were of a serious nature under the Bankrupt Law Consolidation Act, more particularly in reference to the false evidence given by the bankrupt as to a removal of property. He (the commissioner) had spoken to Mr. Commissioner Evans upon the matter, and he concurred in the judgment now given. The Court did not think it right to order a prosecution for perjury, and the case was reduced to this, that under the 160th section the Court must consider what charges against the bankrupt came within the 159th section of the new Act. The charges urged were two: first, that the bankrupt had, with intent to conceal the true state of his affairs, omitted to keep proper books of account, and that he had incurred debts without any reasonable probability of being able to pay them. Judging from the examinations, and particularly from the examination of the bankrupt himself, those charges would appear to be sustained; and the question was whether the Court would refuse the order of discharge upon either or both of those grounds. Under the circumstances, he did not think the order of discharge should be refused; then the question was whether the punishment which the bankrupt had endured had been sufficient, supposing this was an original hearing for an order of discharge. It seemed that the bankrupt had been in

prison since August last, but for aught that appeared the arrest might have been effected before, and the bankrupt have remained in custody during the whole time allowed by the statute. Looking at all the circumstances, the Court thought the bankrupt might now receive an order of discharge—both from his debts and from custody. The bankrupt might consider himself fortunate that he was not indicted criminally in the first instance.

Mr. Turner asked whether the bankrupt should pay the costs of the bankruptcy before obtaining his release? The creditors had been put to considerable expense.

Mr. Munns (Harrison & Lewis) said that if the Court made any such order the effect would be to keep the bankrupt in prison.

The COMMISSIONER.—This must be considered as an original application under the new Act.

Order of discharge upon payment of messenger's fees only.

Jan. 31.—*In re Lenthall*.—This insolvency occurred some ten years ago. The insolvent is now in Australia. The creditors' assignee is dead. The proceedings and documents under the insolvency had been deposited in one of the rooms at the Insolvent Debtors' Court, and had been destroyed by rats.

Mr. D. Bruce stated that the insolvent, a solicitor, had in his possession at the time of his failure, as trustee for Mr. Manning, an assignment of a copyright. It had been understood that the deed was to be given up to Mr. Manning, but in consequence of the death of the creditors' assignee, and other circumstances, that understanding had never been carried out. The publishers were now desirous of issuing a second edition of the work, and they wished to have the assignment of the copyright. Mr. Bruce said that under these circumstances he had to apply for a rule calling on the provisional assignees of the Insolvent Debtors' Court to show cause why he should not deliver the deed. He mentioned that an application had been made on the subject to that official; and, although he had no objection to deliver up the deed, he did not think that, as the court was now established, he had any power in the matter.

The COMMISSIONER.—Would it not be sufficient if I intimate that, in the absence of other objections, the deed should be given up?

Mr. Bruce said that would satisfy him.

The COMMISSIONER.—Very well, you may convey the expression of my opinion to the provisional assignee.

Feb. 1.—*In re Peter Morrison*.—The bankrupt was the managing director of the Bank of Deposit, Pall-Mall. This was an adjourned meeting of creditors under the 110th section of the new Act for the purpose of resolving on the winding-up of the estate out of court.

A proof tendered by Mr. Hackwood (Linklater & Hackwood) having been disallowed,

Mr. C. E. Lewis, for the assignees, said the creditors present had unanimously adopted a resolution of which the following is a copy:—

"In the matter of Peter Morrison, &c.

"This being the day for the adjourned meeting of creditors in this matter, held pursuant to the resolution passed by a majority of creditors of the said bankrupt, present at a meeting of creditors held before Mr. Registrar Miller, at the Court of Bankruptcy, London, on the 18th day of January last, whereby it was resolved that no further proceedings in this matter should be taken in bankruptcy, and that such meeting should be adjourned for fourteen days, in order that notice of such resolution might be given as required by the 110th section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861, we, being a majority in number, representing three-quarters in value of the creditors present at this adjourned meeting, do resolve that the proceedings in bankruptcy in this matter be suspended under and by virtue of the 110th section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861, and that the estate and effects of the said bankrupt be wound up and administered by Joseph William Bennett and E. Winder Collingwood, the assignees of the said bankrupt, elected on the 27th day of December, 1861, out of bankruptcy, in like manner as in bankruptcy, so far as the difference in the mode of administration will admit."

The question now arose how the resolution could be best carried out. The last examination meeting under the bankruptcy was fixed for the 18th of February. Of course it was open for any dissentient creditor to say that the resolution was invalid, and he was anxious to know what the Court would do at the examination meeting.

A desultory discussion ensued. The point being one of practice only and no decision absolutely arrived at, it is sufficient to state that the learned Commissioner expressed himself

in favour of the following course:—The bankrupt must proceed to make a full disclosure of his estate before he could ask for an order of discharge. If the proceedings were suspended by the creditors the Court would not take an active part in them. A very large majority of the creditors had passed a resolution suspending the proceedings, but it was a question whether the Court ought to do anything that would have the effect of relieving the bankrupt, who had not surrendered, from his responsibility. Anything that the assignees might do which was really for the benefit of the creditors the Court would readily acquiesce in. The bankruptcy was not done away with by a resolution under the 110th section, because by the latter part of the section the Court was to give the bankrupt the benefit of an order of discharge when he had made a full disclosure and discovery of his estate and effects. He should do nothing that would have the effect of suspending the proceedings as against the bankrupt. To suspend them in favour of the creditors seemed quite right if they had passed a resolution to that effect in the way pointed out by the Act of Parliament. As at present advised, it appeared to him that the whole proceedings could not be suspended, as that would have the effect of preventing the bankrupt from doing that which it was his first duty to do. He would, however, consider the matter.

Feb. 7.—*In re Wm. Henry Smith*.—Mr. Smith was a solicitor in Lincoln's Inn-fields. He was now adjudicated a bankrupt on his own petition.

(Before Mr. Commissioner GOULBURN.)

Feb. 3.—*In re the "Law Newspaper" Company (Limited)*.—This was an adjourned petition for winding-up, presented by Mr. James Walter, a shareholder. The substance of the petition has already been given in this journal. The allegation bringing the company within the Joint Stock Companies Act of 1856 was that three-fourths of the capital had been lost or become unavailable.

Mr. Linklater appeared for the petitioner, and Mr. Lawrence for the company.

The affidavit of the petitioner stated that the business of the company had been carried on at a loss. The directors had disposed of their interest in their publications by private contract, notwithstanding the protest of the petitioner and his desire that the same should be submitted for sale by public auction; and the petition alleged that larger offers than that accepted had been made to the directors.

Mr. Linklater said he had no complaint whatever to make against the directors personally—he had no doubt they intended the publication of the papers to be a good commercial speculation. He did not blame the company for making such arrangements as would preserve the *Solicitors' Journal and Reporter* from being stopped in its regular publication, for that would have undoubtedly been a serious loss to the profession. Whatever the shortcomings of the company might have been nobody would deny the great ability with which the works had been conducted, and their great use to the profession. What he complained of was that they were not put up to competition and the greatest price realised for them. He contended that the directors had no power thus to dispose of the property of the company, and that they had no right to wind up voluntarily.

The COMMISSIONER.—How many shares does the petitioner hold?

Mr. Linklater.—Only two, but he has an interest in the company. The proceedings with a view to the voluntary winding-up were altogether informal, the requisite number of shareholders not being present at the several meetings. The petitioner considered that the directors had acted against all law and authority, and he now asked that an official liquidator might be appointed, the property of the company duly disposed of, and its affairs legally and properly wound up. He referred to *Solomon v. Laing* (19 L. J. Ex. 295) and several other cases, to show that the petitioner had a right to object to the sale as illegal and not warranted by the articles of association, and unjustifiable under the provisions of the Joint Stock Companies Act, 1856.

The COMMISSIONER said, it was clear that the Court had a discretionary power under the 67th section of the Act of 1856.

Mr. Linklater said that was so. With regard to the way in which the Court ought to exercise the discretion vested in it by the 67th section, he referred to the case of the *Sherwood Loan Society* (30 L. J. Ch. 177). Admittedly, the case came within the terms of the Act of Parliament.

Mr. Lawrence did not deny that three-fourths of the capita

of the company had been lost. The petitioner held two shares only, and since August, 1857, he had omitted to pay any calls upon his shares. The shareholders generally were 170 in number, and they had paid in the aggregate about £5,980 on account of the company. The cases referred to by Mr. Linklater had no bearing whatever upon the present case. He pointed out that the 72nd section of the Joint-Stock Companies Act, 1856, gave the Court a discretion in this matter, and that the 2nd section of the Act of 1858 showed that regard should be had to the wishes of the majority of the creditors. He was prepared to prove that the proceedings of the company had been strictly regular.

The further hearing was then adjourned to Friday.

Feb. 7.—Law Newspaper Company.—The proceedings were opened to-day by a short explanation from Mr. Linklater, in which he stated that had he on the previous hearing on the 3rd inst. been in possession of the information which he now possessed as to the power of the directors to act upon certain resolutions which appeared in the minute-book of the company, and which he had inspected since the last meeting, it would have saved him about three hours of his address to the Court.

Mr. Lawrence contended that the spirit of the Act of Parliament on such a petition as that now before the Court was undoubtedly in favour of non-interference where a company was in course of winding-up voluntarily, and that the Court was bound by the letter of the Act to respect the wish of the great majority of the shareholders. The petitioner had sent a circular to the shareholders asking for support in his proceedings. To this it appeared that only one reply had been received, which was read in court, but which did not in any way support the petitioner in that which he, Mr. Lawrence, contended was a vexatious petition, and could only have been adopted for the sake of annoyance. He then adverted in very strong terms to the circular which had been sent to the whole profession by the publisher of the *Law Times*, and characterised that proceeding as a ruse to ruin the *Solicitors' Journal*, and to endeavour by the pretence of the offer to become the purchaser of the property to prevent the appearance of the paper, and thus to damage it and make it as useless as old metal. He ridiculed the idea that gentlemen (whose names he read) who stood so high in the estimation of the profession as the directors of this company would for a moment be a party to anything which was dishonourable; and he felt bound to say that, to their last farthing if necessary, which he was glad to say was not, they would discharge every liability of the company. He concluded by asking the Court to dismiss the petition with costs.

Mr. Linklater, in reply, contended that, although the petitioner had never attended any meeting of the company—although he admitted he had had notice of the same, and though, at the same time, he had only two shares, and had only paid £10 upon those shares, yet he had brought himself within the requirements of the Act of Parliament. He quoted several cases to show that, though the Court might not grant a winding-up order, yet that it had power to adopt the voluntary winding-up, and that the petitioner was entitled to such an order. He thought that as the publisher of the *Law Times* had made an offer of a larger sum than any one else, he ought to have had the property. (In answer to a question put by the Commissioner, it was stated that no sum had been named by the publisher of the *Law Times*, nor did he even know the amount which had been agreed upon between the vendors and purchaser.) Mr. Linklater further contended that, though the proceedings of the company had been informal, they had been, no doubt, transacted in good faith, but on the ground that three-fourths of the capital had been lost, his client was entitled to his order.

The Court will give judgment on Monday.

INSOLVENT DEBTORS' COURT.

BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY.

Feb. 1.—By the new Bankruptcy Act, which came into operation on the 11th of October last, it was enacted that the clerks and other officers of this court should be transferred to the Court of Bankruptcy, and by the 26th section all moneys belonging to this court were to be carried to the credit of the Accountant-General in Bankruptcy, subject as the Lord Chancellor should direct, "towards defraying the salaries of the clerks and other persons hereby transferred from the Insolvent Debtors' Court to the Court of Bankruptcy." By a subsequent section it is provided that the officers transferred shall receive the full amount of the salary, remuneration, al-

lowances, and compensations that they had been receiving upon the passing of the Act. The Parliamentary grant voted in the estimates for the expenses of the Insolvent Debtors' Court was also to be paid to the account of the Chief Registrar in Bankruptcy. It would be imagined that these provisions were sufficiently explicit, and that the space of three months was ample time to prepare for carrying them out; but, strange as it may appear, it is a fact that for the quarter ending the 11th of January last no official connected with this Court, from the commissioner down to the humblest messenger, has received a single farthing, and even three of the clerks who have been bodily transferred to Basinghall-street from this Court are in the same predicament, rendering public service, but not receiving public remuneration. The consequence of this extraordinary state of things is great inconvenience, and even suffering, especially to the class of officials whose salaries range from £80 to £100 per annum. This is a strange condition of affairs in a public department, and one which, for the sake of all parties, it is to be hoped will speedily cease.

MIDDLESEX SESSIONS.

(Before the ASSISTANT-JUDGE.)

Feb. 4.—The Governor of the House of Detention, Captain Codd, attended to answer the complaint preferred against him by Mr. Best on Monday, of having refused Mr. Justice Mellor's clerk, with a solicitor engaged for the defence, to see two prisoners. They were admitted within the gates, and the inner turnkey was informed that the gentleman was the clerk to one of her Majesty's judges, and that he attended to take the affidavits of the prisoners, it being necessary that such a course should be taken in order that an application might be made for a *certiorari*. The turnkey refused to admit him, and the reason given for the refusal was that he (the clerk) had no letter from the judge to show who he was.

The Governor urged that this was necessary according to the rules and regulations of the prison, as laid down by the visiting justices. The turnkey went to inform him of the application, but before he could get to the inner gate, the judge's clerk had left. He had, however, waited twenty minutes.

The ASSISTANT-JUDGE said it was certainly an irregular proceeding, especially as the turnkey was informed of the purpose for which the clerk attended, but no doubt it would not occur again.

WEST INDIAN INCUMBERED ESTATES COURT.

(Before HENRY J. STONOR, Esq., CHIEF COMMISSIONER.)

No one but owner can object to absolute order for sale, but any incumbrancer may subsequently apply for postponement of sale, or for credit for his incumbrance at the sale.

Feb. 4.—*In re the estates of Thomas John Parker (deceased); Ex parte William Gregory Dawkins, Petitioner.*—This was a motion on behalf of the petitioner, Colonel Dawkins, to make absolute a conditional order for sale of five estates in the Island of Jamaica, called "Hill-side," "Basalette," "Chesterfield," "Bourkesfield," and "Coles Penn." An objection had been filed, as to the two last-named estates, on the part of William Ricketts Parker, who claimed to be interested as owner, or first incumbrancer.

Mr. Culler (solicitor), appeared in support of the objection; Mr. Frederick Smith (solicitor), in support of the motion.

The CHIEF COMMISSIONER held that W. R. Parker had failed to prove himself the owner, and therefore, under the 8th section of the West India Incumbered Estates Amendment Act (21 & 22 Vict. c. 96), had no *locus standi* on the present occasion; but that he had made out a *prima facie* title as incumbrancer, and would be entitled to apply for a postponement of the sale, or to get credit for his incumbrance in the biddings on the sale. The objection was consequently disallowed, and the order for sale made absolute as to all the estates.

Parliament and Legislation.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Thursday, Feb. 6.

THE HIGHWAY ACTS.

Sir G. GREY gave notice that on Friday he would move for leave to bring in a bill to amend the Highway Acts in England and Wales.

Recent Decisions.

EQUITY.

PRACTICE—CHARITY PETITION—SANCTION OF ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

Attorney-General v. Cooper, V.C.K., 10 W. R. 31.

Professional readers will, we are assured, at this day agree as readily as any others in the conviction that it is to the ultimate interest both of lawyers and of clients to introduce into the practice of jurisprudence, as far as is consistent with safety, the principles of economy and simplicity of procedure. If, for example, the Legislature has introduced a statutory remedy by summary application as a concurrent jurisdiction to that which before existed as primarily inherent in a Court, it will be admitted that the more sagacious and, in all senses of the expression, the more expedient choice between the two courses is made—when the speedier, more direct, and less cumbrous method of action is selected—in preference to that which, by the necessity of expense, might, for that very reason, appear to short-sighted practitioners to be most desirable, so far as their professional earnings were concerned. In these days we are sure that solicitors are not behind the rest of mankind in common sense; and, although they have never admitted the imputations cast upon the expense and delay of litigation as being entirely deserved, they do not conceal from themselves the desirableness of affording cheap and speedy justice to every suitor, nor decline to use their influence in aid of reforms suggested with that intention. It is evident to every one that business will not be brought into the courts, so long as persons aggrieved perceive that probable delay, uncertainty and expense must be weighed in the balance against the advantage they seek in the litigation which is open to them, and there is nothing which, in our opinion, in actual experience, more conclusively proves the soundness of our argument than the amount of business done since the abolition of the old pleading system in the chambers of the Common Law Judges and in the County Courts and under the new Bankruptcy Act. Our impression of the course and condition of Chancery practice is not quite so satisfactory. No one can for a moment deny that the Amendment Act of 1852 and the General Orders issued in pursuance of it, together with the Consolidated Orders of last year, have done a great deal to lessen grievances; but it is, nevertheless, notorious that much more might be done, and as certain that the public would use the court much more, if they could use it more expeditiously and cheaply. As a practical exemplification of a state of things within the spirit of these remarks, we propose to call the attention of our readers to a matter of practice, which, though it may not, to adopt the language of Lord Chancellor Cranworth in the case of *Lister's Hospital*, in our most unfavourable impression of it, rise to the evil dignity of an "enormous abuse which has grown up in the administration of charities in reference to proceedings instituted for the good of no one," yet seems to evince an impolitic inclination on the part of litigants in charity business to interrupt the simple and inexpensive methods of relief which the law and the Legislature together have afforded. The Statute of Charitable Uses, 43 Eliz. c. 4, enabled the Lord Chancellor to award commissions to inquire of all gifts to such uses, and of all abuses and breaches of trust relating thereto, and to make orders for the future management of the fund. The decrees of the commissioners when made were returned to the Petty Bag Office or to the common law side of the court, and the petitioners were not bound by the evidence before the commissioners, but might allege and prove new matter upon the basis of the commissioners' returns as in an original suit on the equity side of the court. These commissions, and the suits based upon them, have been in disuse for a long period. The practice by Information, in which the Attorney-General, as representing the interests of the public, brought the affairs of charities under the cognizance of the court without preliminary inquiries and the delay incident to them, became, and, until Sir Samuel Romilly's Act in 1812, continued to be, that which was almost universally adopted. By that Act in every branch of a trust created for charitable purposes, or wherever the direction of a court of equity should be deemed necessary for the administration of such a trust, any two or more persons might, on obtaining the previous sanction of the Attorney or Solicitor-General, apply for relief by petition to the Lord Chancellor or the Master of the Rolls, or the Keeper of the Great Seal, or to the Court of Exchequer. Certain other Acts were passed for the purpose of enabling inquiries and commissions upon the state and regulation of charities, and for the

purpose of improving the internal administration of them upon the application of trustees by petition to the Court of Chancery or Exchequer, in the reign of Geo. 4, Will. 4, and of her present Majesty; but it is not, as we conceive, necessary to our present purpose to refer to them. It is sufficient and important to call the reader's attention only to the Charitable Trusts Act, 1853, passed for the purpose of securing the due administration of charitable trusts, and for the more beneficial application of charity funds in certain cases.

By the 17th section it is enacted that "before any suit, petition, or other proceeding (not being an application in any suit or matter actually pending) for obtaining any relief, order, or direction concerning or relating to any charity, or the estate, funds, property, or income thereof, shall be commenced, presented, or taken by any person whatsoever, there shall be transmitted by such person to the said board, notice in writing of such proposed suit, petition, or proceeding; and the said board may, by an order or certificate signed by their secretary, authorise or direct any suit, petition, or other proceeding to be commenced; and (save as therein otherwise provided) no suit, petition, or other proceeding shall be entertained by the Court of Chancery, or by any court or judge, except upon and in conformity with an order or certificate of the said board; provided that the Act shall not extend to or affect any such petition or proceeding in which any person shall claim any property or seek any relief adversely to any charity." And by the 18th section it is provided, "that it shall be lawful for her Majesty's Attorney-General, acting *ex officio*, to make such applications and take and prosecute such proceedings with respect to any charity, in the Court of Chancery or otherwise, as to him may seem fit, as if the Act had not been passed; and that nothing in the Act contained shall be construed as dispensing with the fiat or allowance of her Majesty's Attorney-General, with respect to any proceeding not being an application under the jurisdiction created by the Act where such fiat or allowance was necessary before the passing of the Act." This being, as we conceive, the state of practice, and it being the intention of Sir S. Romilly's Act to afford the means of administering the trusts of charities without putting the persons interested to the expense of an Information, we think that the taking of objections, like those adopted in the above case of *Attorney-General v. Cooper*, is obnoxious to the principles of sound technical propriety.

The appointment of new trustees is a thing which, as every one knows, is never done by the Court except upon the most satisfactory evidence of fitness, and of the necessity for the appointment. We are not aware of any principle in jurisprudence which would impose upon the conscience and discretion of a judge, when called upon to appoint new trustees of a charity, more astute attention than that which he presumably gives to the same exercise of his judgment in similar administration of private trusts. And in cases in which, as in the case above referred to, the Attorney-General is actually sole plaintiff on the record, it would surely seem sufficient for the interests of the public that the copy of the petition which in the course of practice is served upon him previously to the hearing, and which enables him to inform himself of the exact purport and intention of the application, should obviate the necessity of also procuring his fiat. The decisions of the Court upon these points have not been uniform. In *Re Nightingale* (3 Hare. 336) Vice-Chancellor Wigram, in a case under the Trustee Act, 1 W. 4, c. 60, upon the petition of the persons who administered the charity before the rent charge (which was the subject matter dealt with in the application) ceased to be paid by the landowner liable to pay it, appointed new trustees, and a person to convey the rent-charge to such trustees. And there, there was neither a suit pending, nor was the Attorney-General's fiat either required or mentioned. In the case of *The London, Brighton, &c., Railway* (18 Beav. 608) on the other hand, upon a petition in an Information suit, in which the Attorney-General was of course plaintiff, the Master of the Rolls declined to proceed until the petition was amended by the obtaining of the certificate of the Charity Commissioners and the fiat of the Attorney-General, and by the intitling of the petition, *In the Matter of Sir Samuel Romilly's Act*, although the object of the petition was simply the application of purchase-money of land taken by a railway company to the redemption of land-tax as a reinvestment of such money within the meaning of the Lands Clauses Act. The certificate of the Charity Commissioners having been obtained, the formal attendance and fiat of the Attorney-General would seem to have become unnecessary; and besides, the additional complication of calling in the statutory jurisdiction of the Court under Sir Samuel Romilly's Act, which, as it seems clear, is a con-

current and distinct jurisdiction from that inherent in the Court upon Information, would then become *a fortiori* inexpedient. In *Re Cheshunt College*, 19 Jur. 995, Vice-Chancellor Wood however, held that the Court could make an order directing the proceeds of the sale of freehold parts of charity lands to a railway company to be invested on procuring the enfranchisement of the copyhold parts without the sanction of the Charity Commissioners. These cases left the practice open to the chance of expense, which was all the more unfortunate because it arose from a conflict of opinion in the minds of judges, some of whom were biased by extreme technical caution, while others relied upon what Lord Cranworth, in the *Lister's Hospital* case, called "the good sense of the matter." That case (reported 6 De G. M. & G. 184) was an application, not in a cause, for the disposal of money paid into court by a railway company on the purchase of land belonging to the charity. Vice-Chancellor Kindersley there appears to have been influenced to such an extent by the conflict of practice in the different branches of the court upon the vexed question whether the Charity Commissioners' sanction was necessary to put the Court in motion, either with or without that of the Attorney-General in addition, that he declined to make any order whatever upon the application. Lord Cranworth, speaking for the full Court of Appeal, determined in favour of the continuance of the original jurisdiction of the Court, and said it would be a very strange thing to say that if there is a matter in which the Court ought to act, it cannot act until it is put in motion by the sanction of the Charity Commissioners. In this case there was no suit pending except the proceedings incident to the disposal of the purchase-money paid into court under the Lands Clauses Act. The Attorney-General was not present on the record, nor by consent, nor had his fiat been obtained, as insisted upon in the case in 18 Beav. The petition does not appear to have been entitled in the matter of Sir Samuel Romilly's Act, and so far as it goes, the case seems to be a conclusive authority in favour of the original and simple jurisdiction of the Court, as being competent to deal with the application of funds in a matter before the Court. But in the *Attorney-General v. Cooper*, the old technical objections were urged, and although the decision in *Lister's case* affirmed the jurisdiction of the Court, even without the sanction of the Charity Commissioners' certificate, without the fiat of the Attorney-General, and without the calling into operation the statutory powers created by Sir Samuel Romilly's Act, the Vice-Chancellor was pressed to require the two latter things in addition to the sanction of the Charity Commissioners, which had been already given. The Vice-Chancellor very properly determined, in accordance with the *rationale* of *Lister's case*, that the Court had possession of the subject-matter in a suit actually pending, and that the requiring the fiat of the Attorney-General was a matter for the discretion of the Court, a decision which we conceive to be satisfactory in this respect, that it does something to relieve litigants and their advisers from the necessity in future of incurring a simple application with the expense of calling into operation three concurrent powers or methods of jurisdiction.

COMMON LAW.

SERVICE UNDER UNSTAMPED ARTICLES.—19 & 20 VICT. c. 81.

Ex parte an Articled Clerk, Q. B., 10 W. R. 211.

This is the most recent case with respect to the construction of, and practice under, the 19 & 20 Vict. c. 81; which now regulates the course to be pursued by an articled clerk who finds on the completion of, or during, his service, that his articles are unstamped. Prior to that Act there was no power of stamping articles after the expiration of six months from their execution; and, inasmuch as under 6 & 7 Vict. c. 73, s. 8 an affidavit of execution must be filed and the articles enrolled within that period, and unless presented properly stamped, will not be received by the officer for the latter purpose, clerks who had performed due service in other respects often found themselves much impeded and delayed in commencing their profession, by a neglect or inadvertence of their friends over which they probably themselves had no control and for which they ought not to be held responsible. Accordingly, to remedy this grievance, a provision was inserted in the Act of 19 & 20 Vict. c. 81—viz. s. 3, by which the stamp authorities are allowed (notwithstanding the enactments of a prior Act of 7 Geo. 4, c. 44) to stamp articles (if directed to do so by the Treasury) on payment of a penalty, increasing in amount according to the time that may have elapsed since the execution of the articles. Since this provision, as might be anticipated, there have been

numerous applications to the Court under it, sometimes taking one shape and sometimes another, but usually being of the same nature as the present one—viz. that the Court will allow the service to count from the execution of the articles instead of the time at which they were actually stamped on payment of the penalty exacted. These applications have been from time to time noticed in this journal as they arose, and their general result appears to be that no assistance will be afforded by the Court except in cases of *bona fide* forgetfulness or inadvertence on the part of the applicant's friends. In the present case the cause of omission was the inability of the clerk's father to pay the amount of the stamp required from his extreme poverty; and this was held by the Court a valid excuse, as they acceded to the application. It would appear, however, that they did not expressly dispose of the matter on this ground, but were somewhat perplexed by a doubt whether the interests of the revenue as to the amount of the penalty to be exacted was entrusted to them or to the Lords of the Treasury. Ultimately, they said that by the new Act (19 & 20 Vict. c. 81) the revenue question would appear to be now left to the discretion of the Treasury. And certainly it would be difficult to read the Act otherwise. It would have been an act of great rigour, not to say injustice, to have insisted on a greater penalty being paid than was required by the Commissioners of the Treasury, particularly as such amount in the present instance was the *maximum* of the graduated scale provided in the Act. In fact, this point appears so clear, that it is impossible to avoid a surmise that a fuller report of the case would show that it turned on the sufficiency of the affidavit, and particularly of the plea of poverty, rather than on any conflict of jurisdiction between the Queen's Bench and the Treasury as to the proper assessment of the penalty in these cases.

FACTORS ACT—AGENT OR SERVANT?

Lamb v. Attenborough, Q. B., 10 W. R. 211.

We recently found occasion to notice a decision of the Privy Council on an Indian appeal, which formed a useful reading on the Factors Act (5 & 6 Vict. c. 39), and it was in that case very distinctly laid down how the jury should be directed to decide as between the pledgee and the owner of the property—viz., that they should be told to consider whether the former, as a reasonable man and a man of business, applying his understanding to the circumstances of the transaction, would certainly know that there was either want of authority or *mala fides* on the part of the pledger—and to give their verdict for the plaintiff or defendant according as they found that fact.* In the present case this same statute, and the soundness of the judge's direction to the jury in an action brought by the owner of goods against the pledgee, again became the subject of discussion.

The action was for certain dock warrants pledged by the clerk of the plaintiff to the defendant. On the part of the clerk the transaction was not only unauthorised, but fraudulent; but the defendant had no notice of the fraud, and had previously known the clerk to have sold wine on his own account. The question, therefore, as to the defendant's knowledge of the true nature of the transaction did not arise; and though the rule to set aside the verdict which had passed for the plaintiff was moved for on the ground of *misdirection*, it does not clearly appear by the report what was the misdirection complained of. It may, however, be conjectured that the jury were told that under the circumstances the defendant did not come within the protection of the Factors Act at all—inasmuch as the pledger of the goods was not an "agent entrusted with documents of title" within the meaning of that statute (in which case the knowledge of the pledgee as to the character of the transaction would have been most material), but a *servant* merely of the owner; and as such, incapable of passing the property in the goods by his unauthorised pledge of the warrants—for as the general rule, and without reference to the learning as to sales in market overt, or to transactions carried on by agents of various descriptions, it is only from the owner of goods that any property in them can be derived. If such was the effect of the ruling, it was upheld; as the Court unanimously agreed in confirming the plaintiff in the verdict he had obtained.

FINAL ORDER UNDER 7 & 8 VICT. c. 96, A GOOD PLEA IN BAR.

Markin v. Aldrich, C. P., 10 W. R. 212.

Although all the material provisions of the 7 & 8 Vict. c. 96, have been now swept away by the Bankruptcy Act of last

* See ante, p. 213.

session, it cannot be said that it is yet safe to disregard a decision on its construction—for, in reference to past transactions, at all events, its provisions are still of much interest; and even with regard to future ones, they may throw light incidentally on some of the many dark corners of the new system. The somewhat lengthy case, however, now before us, may, by reason of the recent changes, be more summarily treated than it would otherwise have been; and it is sufficient to state that in it the important point is again canvassed whether a final order of protection under the 7 & 8 Vict. c. 96, is or is not pleadable in bar to an action brought for a debt only appearing in the insolvent's schedule, or whether it only operated as a protection from process. The most recent case in which this matter was discussed was that of *Phillips v. Pickford* (9 C. B. 459); where the Court of Common Pleas followed the opinion of the Exchequer pronounced in *Platel v. Bevil* (2 Exch. 508), and held the final order to be a good bar to such action: as was a final order under the previous Act of 5 & 6 Vict. c. 116, with respect to which no difficulty had ever been felt, but the wording of which is somewhat different. In this decision the Court of Common Pleas in the present case entirely concurred; and, therefore, they have again and more deliberately reversed the decision to which they came in the earlier case of *Toomer v. Genge* (3 C. B. 322); in which they unanimously held that the final order under 7 & 8 Vict. c. 96, was no bar to an action, but a mere protection to the person:—a recantation which is a somewhat striking instance of the proverbial uncertainty of the law.

Scotland.

We have to announce the death of Mr. Alexander Stewart Logan, Scotch advocate, and sheriff of Forfarshire, in his 51st year. He was called to the bar in 1835. The sheriffdom of Forfarshire is now vacant by his death.

Mr. Patrick Fraser, Advocate, has been appointed sheriff of the shire or sheriffdom of Renfrew, in the room of Robert Macfarlane, Esq., appointed a lord of session in Scotland.

Foreign Tribunals and Jurisprudence.

FRANCE.

THE BAR IN PARIS.

We extract the following remarks on the subject of Mr. Jules Favre's much talked of weekly *ré-unions* from the *Morning Star* :—

"These *ré-unions* are held in a room in the Palais de Justice, and called *conferences stagiaires*, because they are for the exclusive benefit of the *avocats stagiaires*, and not the *avocats* who have been called to the Bar, as the term implies. The law students here have four courses to go through in the Law School, and are obliged to write what is called a *thèse*, before being admitted to the finishing course of the *batonnier*. At it they assemble once a week to discuss legal principles and legal questions admitting various interpretations or difficult points on which judges have given contradictory decisions. The French law permits those who have passed in their *thèse* to practise, but a prescriptive custom does not, until they have completed the *année stagiaire*, and attended a greater part of the conferences; and none can be called to the Paris Bar or admitted to any of its honours without having done so. It now happens that all those who attend the *batonnier's* conferences are very young and muster numerously, as the parents of most of the young men who have gone through the Law School, more as amateurs than professionally on account of the reform Jules Favre has effected in the subjects treated at the *batonnier's* conferences and their manner of treatment, reasonably enough think, so long as he occupies his present post, that the *conferences stagiaires* are more important than the preceding *cours*. It thus appears that the *ré-unions* are not for *avocats*, properly so called; but M. Favre receives every second Saturday evening, and only then as *batonnier*, the members of his profession who have been called to the Paris Bar."

THE NEW POSTAGE STAMPS.—Since the 16th or last month, postage-stamps, price 9d., have been procurable at all post-offices.

THE DISBARMENT OF EDWIN JAMES, ESQ., Q.C.

We extract the following from the *Law Magazine* for the present month:—

The disbarring of Mr. Edwin J. James, Q.C., by a "parliament" of the Inner Temple, would have remained simply chronicled by us among the "Events of the Quarter" if that ex-member of the English bar had conducted himself, under his humiliation and fall from professional and public life, with natural and becoming submission to the verdict of society. Indeed, we merely noticed the fact, in our August number, of the benchers of the Inner Temple Inn having on the 18th of July last, after a protracted inquiry of three months, made an order "That the call to the bar of Mr. Edwin John James, Q.C., be vacated; that he be disbarred, and his name struck off the books of this Society." Such order by the forms of the Inns of Court was not final. It had necessarily to be confirmed by "a parliament," and which from the eve of the long vacation and absence of the members of the bar on circuit, could not be accomplished till the following Michaelmas Term. Moreover, an appeal lay to the judges, and Mr. Edwin James had given notice that he should resort to such appellate jurisdiction. Subsequently a "parliament," held on the 7th November, confirmed the decision of the benchers; and Mr. James thinking better of his hasty intention did not appeal. Nor were these circumstances the only motives for our silence. The failure of Mr. James to obtain protection from his creditors, under the statute vulgarly known as the "Gentleman's Act,"—unavoidably exiled him from his own country. Reuter's telegrams of October, afterwards announcing the ex-member's arrival in the United States of America. Now if Mr. James in such expatriation had wisely and humbly set himself down to acquire a transatlantic new status in his profession, and to the acquisition of a better private reputation, we should have been the last journal to have stood in his way. But within the first month of his setting foot in the "New World," besides his arrival being heralded in the American Press as the advent of one of the most eminent leaders of the English bar and one of her Majesty's counsel, he was further proclaimed as a distinguished English visitor of U. S. Spas of autumnal recreation and a frequenter at the receptions of the "White House." This vulgar and objectionable notoriety was consummated by an elaborate memoir in the press of New York of the unknown stranger,—received in England as *autobiographical*, and which "puff direct" was followed by Mr. James's publication of his reminiscences of the bar and by other articles bearing his own name in a U. S. sporting newspaper. Public announcements in eulogistic paragraphs, of his U. S. citizenship were also published and of his intention of being called to the New York bar. Afterwards his admission to the bar of that State was telegraphed home by Reuter! To these rapid announcements succeeded another advertisement in the *New York Press*, viz. the advertised formation of a partnership in the legal profession of that city. Our readers know that in the United States the functions of barrister and solicitor are united. One of our Anglo-Saxon barrister's succeeding acts was the publication of a legal opinion *gratis*, and *pro bono publico* on the seizure of the *Tyent*. He had the bad taste, besides exhibiting melancholy legal ignorance, to volunteer an opinion against his native country and against the SOVEREIGN under whom, notwithstanding, he still "holds silk." These several and scandalous acts of folly and morbid passion for spurious notoriety of course have brought down upon him the severest castigations of the British Press. Mother country evoked punishment. Even *Punch* satirised this legal harlequin. In America he has been received as a political exile, and he has had a few defenders and some sympathizers at home as really the victim of professional jealousy! It is now, therefore, by Mr. James's own acts, past and present, due to the bench, to the bar, and to the public at home, that our journal should record the real and true facts antecedent to his disbarment.

Mr. James was called to the bar of the Inner Temple on the 30th of January, 1836. Although without the benefit of university education he was some years at a reputable private school. His father, much respected, long held the office of secondary in the City of London. The son, Edwin, in his after youth was rather "wild," and like the late Sergeant Wilkins he was for a time by his own calling on the stage. He had studied elocution, or rather declamation; and he considered tragedy his natural forte. We believe that success in the Thespian vocation and the kindness of his parents soon withdrew him from the theatres. Becoming "steadier"

he was entered in the Inner Temple. In some respects on his call to the bar his prospects were propitious. The position of his father was an undoubted advantage to the young advocate, and he had also many connexions among the metropolitan attorneys. Such aids gave him the start of competitors otherwise his superiors; and in confidence and assurance he was not wanting. His bold and jocund manners and his confident mien soon became noticed in the robing rooms of the four courts of Westminster and Guildhall; in the course of a few years he "held briefs" and made motions, and also obtained sessions and assize business on the home circuit. His cases were miscellaneous, and for some time he partly practised in the inferior courts of London; but he never had any reputation as a "lawyer." His law was almost always (except that necessarily acquired in chambers and by attending courts) "got up" for him. As a law officer of the Crown he would have been woefully deficient; and thoroughly unlearned in civil law and the laws of nations he would have been utterly incompetent for any official station. An "opinion" he would not have scrupled confidently to give. We must however in justice admit that of late years his speeches in court, to common juries especially, were marked by talent. In cross-examination he was tolerably prudent, but displaying no sagacity; yet in "flash cases" his addresses were pre-eminent. He understood an ordinary jury, and by appeals to their ignorance, passions, and prejudices, how best to obtain his verdicts. But in the half-dozen causes only of remarkable actions at law and criminal trials in which he led, he displayed no real eloquence or safe judgment—his powers consisting only of unscrupulous assertion, confident demeanour, and sonorous voice. Discretion was no part of his valour as an advocate.

Further, we are compelled to mention the general belief of the profession that Mr. James often "angled" for retainers and briefs. A collection of premature announcements of his real and trumpeted retainers culled from the London press, and of fictitious requisitions to him to become a candidate for vacant seats in the House of Commons, would form an amusing chapter in his reminiscences of the bar. Thus and early he was "always before the public," while his superiors in real talents and law were sitting solitary in their chambers or listening unretained on the back benches of the courts. In the better and highest class of business Mr. James was seldom employed and by no means successful; meeting not only his equals but his superiors in law and advocacy.

We now come to the benchers' inquiry, the climax of his public fall,—only premising that Mr. James was elected for the borough of Marylebone in February, 1859; and that a too frequent speaker in the House of Commons he had no success in that severe ordeal of Parliamentary oratory, being generally considered a declaimer and a "failure."

On the 10th day of April last London was surprised by the publication of an address to his constituents announcing the resignation of his seat; and which act was speedily followed by retirement from Brooke's and the Reform Clubs. In the meanwhile it became notorious that an execution was in his new house in Berkeley-square, on a judgment for a large debt. Rumours also, some of course exaggerated, were current throughout all circles in the metropolis of his irretrievable amount of "indebtedness," and that he must either seek relief in the Bankrupt or Insolvent Courts, or adopt a foreign domicile. He chose at first the latter alternative, removing, we believe, to the continent, *pro tem.*, some time in the same month. A report was current that these significant acts of "resignation" were compelled by the late Lord Yarborough, consequential on Mr. James's involvement of the Earl's young son and heir-apparent in the enormous liability of £30,000; and that Mr. James was, "*en gros*," involved in debts exceeding £100,000.

It was impossible that the benchers of the Inner Temple (and who had unusually but discriminately not elected him to the bench in 1852, when he received his Patent of Queen's Counsel) could shut their eyes and ears to accumulative reports. Our readers know well the constitutions of the several inns of court. The authority of the societies over members may be questioned, and technically it may be denominated "inquisitorial." The bar, however, throughout Europe exists only under similar rules of admission and regulations. All the learned professions more or less are subjected to the same conventional institutions and tests. Abuse of power in any of the societies thus regulating the several professions of "Law, Physic and Divinity," is of rare occurrence. Barristers of all civilians have the least right to complain of self-elected executives, irresponsible bodies, or of their prerogatives. A young man applies for admission to any inn of court; his selection is voluntary. No impediment to membership really exists. A requisition-

certificate is simply signed by any two respectable members of the bar attesting the age, and residence, and condition of life of the applicant, with a reference to some reputable person or persons that inquiry may be made into the applicant's character and situation. There are really no other compliances or tests. Admitted and called the new member only submits himself to the rules and customs of his particular inn. He may change under known regulations to any inn of court; his selection and continuance in his original inn are therefore purely free choice. The powers of the benchers, of all the inns, to *disbar* members for personal or professional ill conduct, are well known to every member of the bar and are by subscription therefore recognised by all. So far from these large and responsible powers being abused we assert that the *latitude* of the benchers of the inns, both as to admission and expulsion, has been of late years the subject of private and public animadversion. The cases of disbarment during the present century are very few; of a *Queen's counsel* at any period Mr. James is the solitary example of expulsion. We will not rake up the call to the bar demanded and refused in one case which occasioned a Commons' select committee of inquiry in 1834. That case may or may not have been an instance of just Parliamentary inquiry, and the individual inculped being a member of the Commons; but we know of no refusals of calls, (excepting a few cases on political grounds and the case of Horne Tooke,) in which admission to the bar have been questioned or membership unjustly denied.* Two or three rejections of claimants to *Bench* membership have been subjects of social discussion. On the whole, we therefore assert that these responsible powers intrusted to the benchers of all the inns have been rather too charitably than harshly exercised. A gentleman called to the bar has an equal chance with his competitors. He becomes practically a partner in the properties of his inn. Public opinion and open competition regulate his success and station as a practising barrister; his business or ill success in his profession is in no way dependent on the benchers of his inn. The Crown can give him precedence or make him a Queen's Counsel when and as the Sovereign (with a responsible Lord Chancellor and Ministry) sees fit. Even refused the *Bench* of his inn the Crown can notwithstanding elevate him to the judgment seat of any court in the United Kingdom or Colonies. Nay, the constitutions and privileges of the inns have been so lately as 1854-5 the subject of a Royal Commission of Inquiry. The commissioners were the present Lord Chancellor, the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench, V. C. Wood, and judges of our common law courts,—a mixed commission including barristers and the late eminent solicitor Mr. Germain Lavie. It is singular that none of the witnesses called or volunteering examination before that commission made any complaints against the exercise of the above "inquisitorial" powers. Further, the searching and able report of these noble and eminent commissioners reported on such prerogatives of the benchers with approval, and as powers indispensable for the protection of the public and the honour of the legal profession. The commissioners' report also made public not only the origin, laws, and regulations of the inns, (voluntarily supplied by their officers,) but also all the inns returned their entire incomes and expenditures. No public bodies, we unhesitatingly aver, apply their revenues more honestly.

* This memorable refusal of the call of Mr. Horne Tooke was the wrong act of the Bench of the Inner Temple. It was based on the false ground of Mr. Tooke having been, and in fact (as the Bench argued) being in *Holy Orders*. Nothing was urged against his character; but it was contended by the Benchers that "once a person always a person." Doubtless this was a sham, and a colourable objection, Mr. Tooke's political opinions and career being the real motives for his rejection. It is, however, right to mention that the Bench was nearly divided on the question of the call, the numbers on both sides being equal within one vote—the call being finally decided in the negative on the casting vote of Mr. Bearcroft, the King's counsel, soon afterwards appointed Chief Justice of Chester. In Mr. Tooke's subsequent great philological work, treating of the "article and interjection," he elucidated his strictures on Mr. Harris's mistakes by alluding to the conduct of the Benchers of this Inn,—"who having first enticed me to quit one profession, after many years of expectation, have very handsomely supplied its place to me by the negation of the other." About the same period Arthur Murphy was refused membership in the Middle Temple, because he had been a *comedian*; but he overcame such disqualification (after arresting the Treasurer for his fees) by entering himself in Lincoln's Inn, and being called through the influence of Lord Mansfield. That noble judge overruled the first cause of refusal as "a frivolous objection." Nor had the Inner Temple benchers been always exclusive and conservative. Amongst the portraits in their hall was formerly one of the notorious Lord Chancellor Jeffries, painted by Kneller in the reign of Charles II. In the succeeding reign the portrait of such a cruel political judge being considered no credit to the society, and the picture being the subject of constant jibes, jokes, and indignities, the liberal benchers, A.D. 1693, made a present of it to the judge's son, Lord Jeffries. This disbarred portrait was "conveyed" to the family mansion at Acton, near Wrexham, in Derbyshire, and we believe it now abides in the country mansion of the Duke of Portland.

We cannot now avoid a statement of facts, in continuing our narrative, of the lamentable and disreputable liability of Mr. James to the adjudication of the benchers of the Inner Temple. We believe that there never was an inquiry conducted with more mature consideration, greater patience and fairness, or in which the result was less questioned or more entirely approved by the public and the profession. We therefore proceed to give an epitome of the inquiry, premising only that the benchers of that inn comprise the names of some of the most distinguished Judges and Queen's Counsel.

Mr. James's antecedents were patent—the benchers more or less having been long personally acquainted with him, with his general professional habits, conduct, and private character. Several of the benchers were members of both Houses of Parliament, and a few may be designated as once his social friends; some were members of the same clubs—all of course were his associates for years at the hall dinners of the inn. Such a body was a special jury, not an inquisition. Could any gentleman wish for a superior tribunal? And Mr. James might have appealed from its decision (but did not) to thirteen English judges.*

We will now briefly state the proceedings of the benchers. The press and all London rife with reports of Mr. James's money transactions and professional dishonours, and one written complaint having been communicated to the benchers, they appointed a committee of three members of their body, to inquire into the circumstances of Mr. James's professional conduct in the principal matters in public circulation. The committee reported grave allegations and imputations against Mr. James. On the report of this committee, Mr. James wrote a letter to the bench, volunteering his anxiety to give the fullest information in his power touching the complaints thus instituted. He therefore did not demur to the jurisdiction; on the contrary, he professed his readiness and solicitude to plead and to justify.

It is a certain fact at this and subsequent stages of the investigation, that the accused had the opportunity of retiring his name from the books of the inn. Indeed, the bench for weeks would probably only have been too glad to have accepted his resignation. It is well known that they have occasionally acted thus leniently; their sole object being simply to purify the bar, not otherwise to punish the offender. But Mr. James, we presume, preferred the chapter of accidents—to run the gauntlet, and trusting in the repugnance of gentlemen to give evidence of his dishonourable acts. He had apparently also at this time "composed" the majority of his creditors. In large claims, the latter will usually sacrifice legal and criminal proceedings to the chance of any future dividend. Mr. James's professional income apparently for some years averaged £7,000 per annum. Lord Yarborough, expecting and seeking not a farthing, seems to have been influenced in assenting to Mr. James taking the benefit of the Act by the evil of permanent expatriation or disbarment to smaller and female creditors. His Lordship's representatives, therefore, were assenting parties to Mr. James continuing practice; that is to say, for such reason to remit his otherwise just punishment. This course of the noble Earl was honourable; and it was stated before the benchers to have been advised by Mr. Joseph Parkes and by Mr. Tallents, of Newark, his Lordship's eminent solicitor. Besides the large number of creditors of Mr. James, the second largest debt in evidence was a sum of upwards of £20,000, imposed on a West Country solicitor. This immense pecuniary "obligation" can hardly be termed a debt. It was perhaps the grossest of all Mr. James's marvellous impositions; and the creditor's heavy loss was untainted by usury or any apparent sinister motives in the lender. The several advances forming this heavy gross debt were *bonâ fide* made under the belief, and Mr. James's solemn assurances, that the borrower had cleared off numerous usurious advances of others; and such new creditor taking an assignment of Mr. James's entire future professional fees dreamed that in four or five years he should be recouped out of the inexhaustible mine of the Fee Book. It may here be observed that evidence before the benchers proved Mr. James not only positively to have denied to Lord Yarborough's advisers the existence of the above £20,000 debt, but that he had also denied to the West Country Solicitor the truth of the report of Lord Worsley's claim! Mr. James doubtless specu-

lated on the secrecy and forbearance of those two heaviest creditors, and having during the inquiry obtained their consents to *pro tem.* protection under the "Gentlemen's Act,"—but he reckoned without his host, and with his usual temerity and habitual folly.

After the report of the committee (a copy of which with each day's evidence was sent to Mr. James) the benchers commenced their own inquiry—on the 7th of June, Mr. James returning from the Continent was their first and thus a voluntary witness. His examination, taken in shorthand, occupied an entire evening; commencing at six o'clock, and lasting till near midnight. There was a full attendance of the benchers, and no ungenerous disposition was displayed in the interrogatories put to him. His own evidence when printed consisted of twenty-one folio pages, exclusive of sixteen other pages of documents and a "statement" put in by himself. On the Thursday following, June 12th, Mr. James was re-examined; his evidence occupying five other folio pages. It is only necessary to state, that his defence on all the counts was artful, specious, and untruthful. Had he confined his vindication to his written "statements in explanation," perused and settled for him (as is reported) by two able members of the bar, and rested his case on that basis, he might perhaps have defied and bamboozled the benchers; and he probably might have escaped with a reprimand, not public. But in his infatuation and audacity he rushed on self-destruction. Lord Yarborough's advisers and the West Country Solicitor had till this period declined to attend the benchers. Mr. James unwittingly on questions of the benchers (Mr. Roebuck interrogating him) expressed no objection to the examination of those gentlemen "if the bench desired it!" In fact, in further answer to the recorder, Mr. James consented in an evil moment to the benchers' summons of Mr. Parkes, Mr. Tallents, and the West Country Solicitor. When asked if the bench might examine the latter, and a damning witness, his insane reply was "I have not the least objection!"

(To be continued.)

MR. HUBBARD, M.P., ON THE INCOME TAX.

On the occasion of Mr. Hubbard M.P., addressing a meeting of his constituents in the Town Hall, Buckingham, on the evening of the 24th ult., he made the following observations upon the subject of the income-tax:—

"The income-tax had become a national institution; Sir Robert Peel, who in 1842 promised that it should last only three years, as the necessary accompaniment of great fiscal changes which were to render us altogether independent of the income-tax, did not live to see the baselessness of his expectations. Since then it had been the lot of successive Chancellors of the Exchequer to levy this hateful tax, but there was not one who did not begin his Budget by saying it was a cursed impost which he hoped soon to get rid of altogether. It was the conviction that it would not be got rid of which led him (Mr. Hubbard) at the commencement of last session to move for a committee to consider whether this tax, in itself so hateful, so unequal, so oppressive, could not be adjusted so as to divest it at least of a portion of its inequality and injustice. He made that motion without the slightest concert with any party or any individual, and he sat down not knowing whether a single man would rise to second his motion. It was opposed by the Government to the utmost of their power, the leader of the Opposition discouraging it by his absence and by his instructions, yet he carried the motion for a revision of the income-tax. It was long ere the committee could be got together; and then he found that, though he was sure of his adversaries, he was by no means certain of those who, he supposed, might intelligently support his views. He did not hesitate to say that the progress of that committee was a struggle from day to day to continue its existence. He was challenged continually to bring the inquiry to a close; he was met by a demand for what was simply impossible—witnesses to support every part of a scheme with which they were unacquainted. By the end of the session several gentlemen who had hitherto supported him left for their respective homes. It was owing to that circumstance that, on the important question whether his own report should be, not adopted, but reported with the evidence, he was beaten by a majority of one, and that, too, not on the ground that the basis he had laid down was an unsuitable one for the adjustment of the tax, but on the ground that a question which had been twice inquired into and twice dropped was incapable of a successful solution. His

* We in this article scrupulously limit our comments to the charges before the Inn benchers against Mr. James. But a fourth and most scandalous professional transaction was at the same period published by Colonel Dickson—of Mr. James's conduct to him after the trial of the Colonel's action against the Earl of Wilton. Vide 4th ed. of the pamphlet of the Colonel.

scheme provided that men should be taxed according to their power of spending, so that a man with £1,000 in the funds would pay on £1,000; a man with £1,000 from land, and having to expend in insurance and repairs £60, would pay on £920; while a man with £1,000 from house property, for which the outgoings might be £160, would pay on £840. Another feature was that incomes from trades, professions, and salaries should be taxed on two-thirds of the amount, that being his estimate of the proportion which a man would, on the average, lay by as a provision for the future, and which under the present system was taxed twice over. He adduced in support of his principle the deduction already allowed for life assurance, and pointed out that under the present system of assessment a man whose income for three successive years is £2,500, £500, and nothing, pays only half the income-tax which another man with a regular salary of £1,000 a year must pay. Feeling sure that the income-tax could not be removed, he did not intend to let the matter drop."

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS.

THE CITY OF LONDON AND THE NEW GAS ACT.

At a recent meeting of the Metropolitan Board of Works the clerk laid before the board the following opinions of the Attorney-General, the Solicitor-General, and Mr. Gray on a case submitted to them from the board as to whether the Gas Act of last session transferred the powers hitherto exercised by the city of London in respect to the appointment of inspectors and the testing of meters to this board. In the first case the Attorney-General (then Solicitor-General) and Mr. Gray gave an opinion with which the Government were not satisfied, and it accordingly took the joint opinions of the Attorney-General and the Solicitor-General. Both documents are appended, and it will be seen that the Attorney-General, by one opinion completely reversed the one he gave on a former occasion. The first opinion was as follows:—

"1. We are of opinion that the Act of 1861 brings the city of London within the powers conferred on the Metropolitan Board of Works, and that neither the Commissioners of Sewers nor the Justices of the city of London have any power to appoint inspectors, or perform other functions under that Act or the other Acts referred to.

"2. We are of opinion that appeals from magistrates and gas inspectors are to be made to the Metropolitan Board of Works, and not to the Justices in Quarter Sessions.

"W. ATHERTON.
"JOHN GRAY.

In reference to the above the following letter and enclosure was received from the corporation of the city of London:—

"METROPOLIS GAS AMENDMENT ACT.

"Remembrancer's Office, Guildhall, Jan. 21.

"Sir,—I am directed by the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor to transmit to you, for the information of the Metropolitan Board of Works, the enclosed copy of an opinion of her Majesty's Attorney and Solicitor-Generals upon the subject of this Act, which the Lord Mayor and Justices of the city of London have received from the Home Office.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
"E. TYRRELL, City Remembrancer.

"J. Pollard, Esq."

"We are of opinion that the 24th and 25th Vict. cap. 79, does not transfer the powers conferred by the Municipal Act (22 & 23 Vict. c. 66) on the justices of the county of the city of London to the Metropolitan Board. The powers transferred are in terms, the "powers conferred on the justices of the peace of any county, &c., so far as relates to the metropolis, defined by the 18 & 19 Vict. c. 120." Within the metropolis, as so defined, there are parts of four counties (Middlesex, Surrey, Kent, and Essex), and also the county of the city of London and the distinction between a county and a county of a city is carefully observed in the principal Act. Thus the expression "justice of the peace of any county," as used in the 24 & 25 Vict. does not necessarily include the justices of the peace of a county of a city, and that they were not intended to apply to the city of London appears to us to be placed beyond a doubt by the proviso that the expenses incurred by the board, in pursuance of the Act which directs the transfer, shall be defrayed by them out of the rates leviable by them within their jurisdiction, exclusive of the city of London. The expense within the city of London of carrying the Gas Act into effect had been previously cast on the consolidated sewers' rate of the city, and

it is not reasonable to suppose that it was intended to shift the burden on the ratepayers of the metropolis, exclusive of the city of London.

"W. ATHERTON.

"Temple, Jan. 9." "ROUNDELL PALMER."

Mr. SMITH, the solicitor to the board, laid before the board the following further opinion in reference to the above:—

"Since writing our opinion of the 21st of October last, we have had occasion to reconsider the question whether the statute 24 & 25 Vict. c. 79, being the Act to amend the Metropolitan Gas Act, brings the city of London within the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Board of Works, and that reconsideration has led us to alter the opinion we then gave.

"The view we now take of the Act is this,—The powers transferred by the Act are expressed to be 'the powers conferred on the justices of the peace of any county' within the defined metropolitan area; and although the city of London is undoubtedly a 'county,' yet it is a county of a city; and the Act conferring the powers (being 22 & 23 Vict. c. 66) in doing so carefully distinguishes between counties and counties of cities, clearly showing thereby that, as regards that enactment, the one was not meant to include the other. The two Acts to which we have referred being strictly *in pari materia*, the same restricted meaning would, according to ordinary rules of construction, be assigned to the same expression (Justices of counties) as occurring in each of the statutes; and that such restriction was intended appears to us to be placed beyond any reasonable doubt by the proviso that the expenses of and attending the exercise of the powers transferred are to be defrayed out of rates to which the city of London is not to contribute.

"We are, therefore, of opinion that the Act confers on the Metropolitan Board of Works no power or jurisdiction within the city of London.

"W. ATHERTON.

"Temple, Jan. 10."

"JOHN GRAY."

These documents, so contrasting with each other, excited some surprise among the members of the board, and it was suggested that further opinion should be taken, as the Attorney-General had given his both ways; but eventually the whole question was referred to the gas committee.

Public Companies.

BILLS IN PARLIAMENT

FOR THE FORMATION OF NEW LINES OF RAILWAY IN ENGLAND AND WALES.

The Standing Orders have been complied with in the following cases:—

LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE.

New lines from Askern Junction to Goole, and from Goole to Hull and Selby at Cave Sands. Capital, £248,000.

BISHOP'S WALTHAM, BOTLEY, AND BURELLEDON.

New line between these points in connection with the London and South Western. Capital, £60,000.

EASTERN COUNTIES.

New lines in Middlesex. The first commencing at Tottenham, by a junction with the Northern and Eastern, and terminating in junction with the North London Railway at Hackney. The second commencing at Edmonton, by a junction with the Enfield and Edmonton branch of the Eastern Counties Railway, and terminating at Tottenham. Capital, £140,000.

MIDLAND.

New lines—the first from Duffield to a junction with the Manchester and Midland Railways; the second from Great Bowden, in Leicestershire, to near Market Harborough; and the third from the Bristol and Birmingham to a junction with the Birmingham Extension. Capital, £120,000.

MID-KENT AND ADDISCOMBE.

New line from Beckenham to Croydon.

NEWPORT AND RYDE.

New line from Newport to Ryde. Capital, £100,000.

NORTH-EASTERN.

New lines between Blaydon and Conside, with branches. Capital, £165,000.

RICKMANSWORTH, AMERSHAM, AND CHESHAM.

New line between these places. Capital, £91,000.

SOUTH STAFFORDSHIRE.

New line to connect the Cannock Chase and South Staffordshire Railways. Capital, £40,000.

MEETINGS.

COCKERMOUTH AND WORKINGTON.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 31st ult., a dividend of 10s. per share, being at the rate of £5 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

LONDONDERRY AND ENNISKILLEN.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 4th inst., the following dividends were declared:—a dividend at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum to the 31st of December last on 245 half-shares; also at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum on the 3,185 £10 preference shares; and at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum, being 6s. 3d. per share, together with 1s. 3d. per share on account of arrears, making 7s. 6d. per share, on the 19,819 half-shares of £12 10s. each, the directors being indemnified in the event of any proceedings being taken against them in respect of, and to the extent of, such arrears.

VICTORIA STATION AND PIMLICO.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 5th inst., a dividend of £2 per cent. was declared for the past half-year.

WIMBLEDON AND CROYDON.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 4th inst., a formal resolution, declaring a dividend of 4s. per share, being at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum, clear of all expenses or deductions, except income-tax, for the half-year, was agreed to.

The catalogue of private bills in the session of 1862, as made up by the examiners, has recently been issued. Of 329 private bills, the following relate to Scotland:—Aberdeen Police, Water, and Improvement; Bathgate and Airdrie Roads; Berwickshire Railway; Berwick-upon-Tweed Harbour; Caledonian Railway (Deviations, &c.); Caledonian Railway (Leith Branches); Deeside Railway; Dundee and Perth and Aberdeen Railway Junction; and Dundee and Newtyle Railway; Dundee Water; Edinburgh, Dunfermline, and Perth Junction Railway; Edinburgh, Dunfermline, and Perth Junction Railway (No. 2); Edinburgh and Glasgow, and Caledonian and Dumbartonshire Junction Railway Companies; Edinburgh and Glasgow, and Glasgow, Dumbarton, and Helensburgh Railway Companies; Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway; Edinburgh, Perth, and Dundee and Fife and Kinross Railway Companies; Edinburgh Roads and Streets; Forfarshire Roads and Bridges; Glasgow Barony Parochial Board; Glasgow Police; Great North of Scotland Railway; Greenock and Wemyss Bay Railway; Inverness and Aberdeen Junction; and Inverness and Rosshire Railway Companies; London and Edinburgh Shipping Company; North British Insurance Company; North British and Glasgow and South Western Railway and other Companies; North British Railway and Carlisle and Silorth Bay Railway and Dock Companies; North British Railway, Edinburgh, Perth, and Dundee Railway, and West of Fife Railway and Harbour Companies; North British Railway (Monkton Hill and Omiston and Dalkeith Branches); North British Railway and Port Carlisle Dock and Railway Companies; Ross Turnpike Trust; Scottish Central Railway; Scottish North Eastern Railway; Scottish Northern Junction Railway.

University Intelligence.

CAMBRIDGE.

LAW.

The Board of Legal Studies publishes the following subjects of examination for honours in law and for the Chancellor's Medal in the year 1863:—

Roman Law.—Gai Comm., Justiniani Institut., Digest—Lib. ii. (De Vindications), Cicero de Legibus.—For translation.

The paper of questions will be set principally from the Roman Law of Obligations and Actions.

English Law.—Blackstone's Comm. Vols. 3 and 4 (Private and Public Wrongs), Joshua Williams's Law of Real Property,

Broom's Commentaries on the Common Law, Book II. (on Contracts).

English History.—Hallam's Constitutional History, Vols. 1, 2, and 3.

International Law.—(a) Blockade, Right of Search, Right of Asylum in Neutral Ports.—Reference may be made to any English treatise on International Law, to Tudor's leading cases in mere law, and to the French treatises of Hautefeuille and Ortolan. (b) The Peace and Treaty of Ghent, Dec. 1814.

CHANCELLOR'S MEDAL.

Roman Law.—(a) The matter comprised in the four books of Gaius and Justinian and explained in Sandars's Notes and Commentary. (b) Ancient Law by Dr. Maine.

English Law.—(a) Dwarries on the Statutes. (b) The Law relating to Justices of the Peace as explained in Paley on Convictions, and Stone's Petty Sessions.

English History.—The reigns of William III. and Anne, with special reference to the leading statutes and state trials of the time.

International Law.—Westlake's Private International Law.

THE HOUSE OF LORDS.—In consequence of the death of the Earl Mount-Edgcombe, Viscount Valletort, M.P., will take his seat in virtue of the earldom, he being the fifth earl. His lordship was born in 1832. By the death of Baron Ponsonby, intelligence of which reached England in October, his cousin, the Hon. William Ponsonby, succeeds to the peerage. His lordship is the only son of the late Hon. and Right Rev. Richard Ponsonby, D.D., Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. By the death of the Earl of Yarborough, Lord Worsley, late M.P. for Great Grimsby, succeeds to the peerage. By the death of the Earl of Eglinton and the Earl Fortescue the number of peers has been reduced by two, the present Earl of Eglinton being only twenty years of age, and the present Earl Fortescue having for some time past had a seat in the House of Lords as Viscount Ebrington.

In February, 1861, William Henry Stephens, designated as a "newspaper proprietor, formerly residing at Upper Belgrave-place, in the county of Middlesex, and now residing at Dunoon, in the county of Argyll," obtained sequestration at his own instance. In this statutory examination the bankrupt said,—"I came to Scotland for sequestration, partly in order to avoid exposure in London, and partly because I understood that the matter could be carried through more cheaply in Scotland, and this was of importance to me, as my father had refused to make any advances for the purpose unless I came to this country. I was recommended to come to the county of Argyll in particular because I was not well, and because it was a quiet place, where unnecessary publicity would be avoided." The bankrupt was discharged on the 17th of September, but meantime a petition for recall had been presented to the Court of Session in behalf of two non-concurring creditors. The case was disposed of by the second division of the Court last week. Lord Justice Clerk, in giving judgment, said the present was a strong case for recall, and it seemed most expedient that the bankrupt's estate should be distributed among his creditors according to the law of England. The Bankrupt was an Englishman who had no connection with Scotland, whose creditors, with trifling exceptions (if any), were English, whose estate (if any) was in England, and whose avowed object in coming to Scotland was to obtain sequestration. It was a sequestration devised and intended in its origin and whole object, not for the benefit of creditors or for the distribution of the bankrupt's estate, but for the benefit of the bankrupt alone, its sole object being to obtain his discharge. The claims of the creditors who had been certified as concurring had not been ranked on the estate, or even properly lodged in the sequestration; the fact of a discharge having been obtained under these circumstances could therefore not be much regarded. The more he examined into the case, the more satisfied he became that this sequestration had been a mockery of the process of sequestration.

The insurance statistics of last year reveal some very interesting and instructive insurance facts. During 1861, thirteen companies have ceased to exist; ten have transferred their business; five new ones have been founded, and nineteen projected. Forty-nine are now in Chancery under a winding-up process, seven of these having obtained admission into this select list during the past year. Six companies have changed their place of business, and one branch office has been opened. Four secretaries, two actuaries, and five managers have been

appointed to fill up vacancies caused by resignation and otherwise. The chairman of two insurance companies have been elected M.P.'s by two very large and influential constituencies. Four directors, two managers, and one medical officer have died during the year. One manager, one actuary, and one secretary, being incapacitated by old age or affliction, have retired into private life. Since the year 1844 599 companies have been projected, 267 founded, 246 have ceased to exist, 52 have opened branch offices, 187 have changed their places of business; 11 amalgamations have been effected; 144 offices have transferred their businesses to other institutions, and 49 have been, or are being wound up in Chancery. Ninety-three insurance companies have discontinued their fire business, or in cases where they were only fire offices they have been dissolved.

Court Papers.

Court of Chancery.

SITTINGS AFTER HILARY TERM, 1862.

LORD CHANCELLOR.

Lincoln's Inn.

Friday, Feb. 7	{ The First Seal.— App. mtns. & apps. Petns. & appeals.
Saturday .. 8	..
Monday 10	..
Tuesday 11	Appeals.
Wednesday .. 12	..
Thursday .. 13	{ The Second Seal.— App. mtns. & apps.
Friday 14	..
Saturday 15	..
Monday 17	Appeals.
Tuesday 18	..
Wednesday .. 19	..
Thursday .. 20	{ The Third Seal.— App. mtns. & apps.
Friday 21	..
Saturday 22	..
Monday 24	Appeals.
Tuesday 25	..
Wednesday .. 26	..
Thursday .. 27	{ The Fourth Seal.— App. mtns. & apps.
Friday 28	..
Saturday 29	..
Monday 3	Appeals.
Tuesday 4	..
Wednesday .. 5	..
Thursday .. 6	{ The Fifth Seal.— App. mtns. & apps.
Friday 7	..
Saturday 8	..
Monday 10	Appeals.
Tuesday 11	..
Wednesday .. 12	..
Thursday .. 13	{ The Sixth Seal.— App. mtns. & apps.
Friday 14	..
Saturday 15	..
Monday 17	Appeals.
Tuesday 18	..
Wednesday .. 19	..
Thursday .. 20	{ The Seventh Seal.— App. mtns. & apps.
Friday 21	..
Saturday 22	..

NOTICE.—The days (if any) on which the Lord Chancellor shall be engaged in the House of Lords are excepted.

MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

Chancery-lane.

Friday, Feb. 7	{ The First Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa. Petns., sht. caus., adj. sums., and general paper.
Saturday 8	..
Monday 10	..
Tuesday 11	General paper.
Wednesday .. 12	..
Thursday .. 13	{ The Second Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa. General paper.
Friday 14	..
Saturday 15	{ Petns., sht. caus., adj. sums., and general paper.
Monday 17	..
Tuesday 18	General paper.
Wednesday .. 19	..
Thursday .. 20	{ The Third Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa. General paper.
Friday 21	..
Saturday 22	{ Petns., sht. caus., adj. sums., and general paper.

Monday 24	..
Tuesday 25	General paper.
Wednesday .. 26	..
Thursday .. 27	{ The Fourth Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa. General paper.
Friday 28	..
Saturday 29	..
Satrdy., Mar. 1	{ Petns., sht. caus., adj. sums., and general paper.
Monday 3	..
Tuesday 4	General paper.
Wednesday .. 5	..
Thursday .. 6	{ The Fifth Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa. General paper.
Friday 7	..
Saturday 8	{ Petns., sht. caus., adj. sums., and general paper.
Monday 10	..
Tuesday 11	General paper.
Wednesday .. 12	..
Thursday .. 13	{ The Sixth Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa. General paper.
Friday 14	..
Saturday 15	{ Petns., sht. caus., adj. sums., and general paper.
Monday 17	..
Tuesday 18	General paper.
Wednesday .. 19	..
Thursday .. 20	{ The Seventh Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa. General paper.
Friday 21	..
Saturday 22	{ Petns., sht. caus., adj. sums., and general paper.

N.B.—Unopposed petitions must be presented and copies left with the Secretary, on or before the Thursday preceding the Saturday on which it is intended they should be heard; and any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard.

LORDS JUSTICES.

Lincoln's Inn.

Friday, Feb. 7	{ The First Seal.— App. mtns. & apps.
Saturday 8	..
Monday 10	..
Tuesday 11	Appeals.
Wednesday .. 12	..
Thursday .. 13	{ The Second Seal.— App. mtns. & apps. Petns. in lunacy & bankcy., appeal petitions, & apps.
Friday 14	..
Saturday 15	..
Monday 17	..
Tuesday 18	Appeals.
Wednesday .. 19	..
Thursday .. 20	{ The Third Seal.— App. mtns. & apps. Petns. in lunacy & bankcy., appeal petitions, & apps.
Friday 21	..
Saturday 22	..
Monday 24	..
Tuesday 25	Appeals.
Wednesday .. 26	..
Thursday .. 27	{ The Fourth Seal.— App. mtns. & apps. Petns. in lunacy & bankcy., appeal petitions, & apps.
Friday 28	..

Satrdy., Mar. 1	..
Monday 3	..
Tuesday 4	Appeals.
Wednesday .. 5	..
Thursday .. 6	{ The Fifth Seal.— App. mtns. & apps. Petns. in lunacy & bankcy., appeal petitions, & apps.
Friday 7	..
Saturday 8	..
Monday 10	..
Tuesday 11	Appeals.
Wednesday .. 12	..
Thursday .. 13	{ The Sixth Seal.— App. mtns. & apps. Petns. in lunacy & bankcy., appeal petitions, & apps.
Friday 14	..
Saturday 15	..
Monday 17	..
Tuesday 18	Appeals.
Wednesday .. 19	..
Thursday .. 20	{ The Seventh Seal.— App. mtns. & apps. Petns. in lunacy & bankcy., appeal petitions, & apps.
Friday 21	..
Saturday 22	..

NOTICE.—The days (if any) on which the Lords Justices shall be engaged in the Full Court, or at the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, are excepted.

V. C. SIR R. T. KINDERSLEY.

Lincoln's Inn.

Friday, Feb. 7	{ The First Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa. Sht. causes, adj. sums., & gen. pa.
Saturday 8	..
Monday 10	..
Tuesday 11	General paper.
Wednesday .. 12	..
Thursday .. 13	{ The Second Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 14	..
Saturday 15	{ Sht. causes, adj. sums., & gen. pa.
Monday 17	..
Tuesday 18	General paper.
Wednesday .. 19	..
Thursday .. 20	{ The Third Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 21	..
Saturday 22	{ Sht. causes, adj. sums., & gen. pa.
Monday 24	..
Tuesday 25	General paper.
Wednesday .. 26	..
Thursday .. 27	{ The Fourth Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 28	..
Saturday 29	{ Sht. causes, adj. sums., & gen. pa.
Satrdy., Mar. 1	..
Monday 3	..
Tuesday 4	General paper.
Wednesday .. 5	..
Thursday .. 6	{ The Fifth Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 7	..
Saturday 8	{ Sht. causes, adj. sums., & gen. pa.
Monday 10	..
Tuesday 11	General paper.
Wednesday .. 12	..
Thursday .. 13	{ The Sixth Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 14	..
Saturday 15	{ Sht. causes, adj. sums., & gen. pa.
Monday 17	..
Tuesday 18	General paper.
Wednesday .. 19	..
Thursday .. 20	{ The Seventh Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 21	..
Saturday 22	{ Sht. causes, adj. sums., & gen. pa.

N.B.—Any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked, at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard.

V. C. SIR JOHN STUART.

Lincoln's Inn.

Friday, Feb. 7	{ The First Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa. Petns., sht. causes, & general paper.
Saturday 8	..
Monday 10	..
Tuesday 11	General paper.
Wednesday .. 12	..
Thursday .. 13	{ The Second Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.

Friday 14	{ Petns. & gen. pa. Short causes and general paper.
Saturday 15	..
Monday 17	..
Tuesday 18	General paper.
Wednesday .. 19	..
Thursday .. 20	{ The Third Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 21	..
Saturday 22	{ Sht. causes and general paper.
Monday 24	..
Tuesday 25	General paper.
Wednesday .. 26	..
Thursday .. 27	{ The Fourth Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 28	..
Saturday 29	{ Petns. & gen. pa. Short causes and general paper.
Satrdy., Mar. 1	..
Monday 3	..
Tuesday 4	General paper.
Wednesday .. 5	..
Thursday .. 6	{ The Fifth Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 7	..
Saturday 8	{ Sht. causes and general paper.
Monday 10	..
Tuesday 11	General paper.
Wednesday .. 12	..
Thursday .. 13	{ The Sixth Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 14	..
Saturday 15	{ Short causes and general paper.
Monday 17	..
Tuesday 18	General paper.
Wednesday .. 19	..
Thursday .. 20	{ The Seventh Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 21	..
Saturday 22	{ Sht. causes, & general paper.

N.B.—Any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked, at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard.

V. C. SIR W. P. WOOD.

Lincoln's Inn.

Friday, Feb. 7	{ The First Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa. Petns., sht. causes, & general paper.
Saturday 8	..
Monday 10	..
Tuesday 11	General paper.
Wednesday .. 12	..
Thursday .. 13	{ The Second Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 14	..
Saturday 15	{ Petns., sht. causes, & general paper.
Monday 17	..
Tuesday 18	General paper.
Wednesday .. 19	..
Thursday .. 20	{ The Third Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 21	..
Saturday 22	{ Petns., sht. causes, & general paper.
Monday 24	..
Tuesday 25	General paper.
Wednesday .. 26	..
Thursday .. 27	{ The Fourth Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 28	..
Saturday 29	{ Petns., sht. causes, & general paper.
Satrdy., Mar. 1	..
Monday 3	..
Tuesday 4	General paper.
Wednesday .. 5	..
Thursday .. 6	{ The Fifth Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 7	..
Saturday 8	{ Petns., sht. causes, & general paper.
Monday 10	..
Tuesday 11	General paper.
Wednesday .. 12	..
Thursday .. 13	{ The Sixth Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 14	..
Saturday 15	{ Petns., sht. causes, & general paper.
Monday 17	..
Tuesday 18	General paper.
Wednesday .. 19	..
Thursday .. 20	{ The Seventh Seal.— Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday 21	..
Saturday 22	{ Petns., sht. causes, & general paper.

N.B.—Any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked, at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard.

Law Students' Journal.

LAW LECTURES AT THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY, 1861-62.

Mr. FREDMAN OLIVER HAYNES, on Conveyancing, Monday, February, 10.
Mr. WILLIAM MURRAY, on Common Law and Mercantile Law, Friday, February, 14.

Marriages and Deaths.

MARRIAGES.

BATTY-WILSON—On Feb 1, Espine Batty, Esq., of St. Stephen's-green, Dublin, barrister-at-law, to Maria, daughter of Robert Wilson, Esq., late of Richmond, Monkstown, county Dublin.
WRENTMORE-KELLY—On Jan 30, J. H. Wrentmore, Esq., of Lincoln's-inn-fields, solicitor, to Katherine, daughter of the late William Kelly, Esq.
YORKS-CHAMBER—On Feb 3, Joseph Augustus Yorks, Esq., of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law, to Florence Eliza Mary, daughter of Thomas Chambers, Esq., of Warwick-gardens, Kensington, and great niece of the late Mr. Justice Chambers.

DEATHS.

MORGAN—On Feb 2, at Bridgend, Glamorganshire, Cadogan Morgan, Esq., late of the Middle Temple, barrister, aged 63.
PRATT—On Feb 4, at Newark-on-Trent, Notts, Emily, infant daughter of Becher Pratt, Esq., solicitor.
RUSSELL—On Jan 20, at Southbank, near Edinburgh, John Russell, Esq., C.S., and late Principal Clerk of Session, aged 53.

London Gazettes.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

FRIDAY, Jan. 31, 1862.

Swinburne, Joseph Willis, & Thomas Swinburne (J. W. & T. Swinburne), Gentshead, Attorneys-at-Law and Solicitors. Jan. 1. By mutual consent.

TUESDAY, Feb. 4, 1862.

Edwards, Sommersby, & Richard Francis Leake, Long Buckley, Welford, Northamptonshire, Attorneys-at-Law and Solicitors (Edwards & Leake). Jan. 29. By mutual consent.

Windings-up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, Jan. 31, 1862.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Defender Fire and Life Insurance Company.—Order to wind-up, Jan. 13. M.R.
Times Fire Assurance Company.—The Master of the Rolls has appointed George Harvey Jay, Esq., Moorgate-st., London, Accountant, Official Manager of this Company.

LIMITED IN BANKRUPTCY.

Taranaki Steel Iron Company (Limited).—Commissioner Fane will, on Feb. 11, at 2, proceed to settle the list of contributors of this company. Creditors to prove their debts at same time.

TUESDAY, Feb. 4, 1862.

LIMITED IN BANKRUPTCY.

Great Northern and Midland Coal Company (Limited).—Creditors to prove their debts before Commissioner Goulburn, on Feb. 28, at 11.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, Jan. 31, 1862.

Bellamy, William, Fights, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Feb 12. Sols Rice & Wighton, Boston.
Cubitt, Sir William, Great George-st, Westminster. May 6. Sols Bircham, Dalrymple, & Drake, 46 Parliament-st, Westminster.
Douglas, General Sir Howard, Bart., G.C.B., 15 Green-st, Grosvenor-sq. March 31. Sols Farrer, Overy, & Farrer, 66 Lincoln's-inn-fields.
Earth, John, Huddersfield, Soap Agent. March 1. Sol Clough, 37 Market-st, Huddersfield.
Gardiner, Douglas Charles, Wanstead Hall, Essex, Esq. March 25. Sols Stevens & Satchell, 6 Queen-st, Cheap-side, London.
Goodenough, Joseph, Gillingham, Dorset, Esq. March 1. Sols Andrews & Cockram, Dorchester.
Graham, Alexander, Chapel-st, Grosvenor-sq, Middlesex, Gent. April 2. Sols Capron, Brabant, Capron, & Dalton, Saville-pl, New Burlington-st, London.
Higgs, John, Harwood, Cheshire, Staffordshire, Gent. March 25. Sol Thacker, Cheshire.
Jefferys, John, Grove-ter, Pomeroy-st, Hatcham, near Deptford, Surrey, Gent., formerly of the Grove Iron Foundry, Great Guildford-st, Southwark, Surrey, Ironfounder. March 31. Sols Holmer & Robinson, 38 Bowgate-hill, London.
Jones, Anne, Vale-st, Denbigh, Spinstress. July 5. Evan Pierce, M.D. Salisbury-pl, Denbigh, and William Parry, Chemist, High-st, Denbigh, Executors.
Moore, Sarah, Rasingstoke, Hants. March 1. Sol Dove, 54 Hunter-st, Brunswick-sq, London.
Rostron, Lawrence, Broughton-st, Salford, Gent. April 1. Sols Charleswood & Ormrod, 3 Clarendon-st, Manchester.
Sherry, James, Leigh, Dorset, Farmer. March 1. Sols Andrews & Cockram, Dorchester.

Stone, James, West Grinstead, Sussex, Yeoman. March 25. Sol Motwin, Horsham.
Surtess, Anbone, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and Pigion, Northumberland, Wine Merchant. April 7. Sol Stanton, 72 Piggin-st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Taylor, William, Ipswich, Timber Merchant. March 22. Sol Nash, Ipswich.
Wayth, Mrs. Anne, Bearstead, Kent. March 27. W. H. Bond, 3 Bell-yd, Fleet-st, London.
White, John, formerly of Redcliff-hill, Redcliff, Bristol, but late of 3 Clarence-pl, Coronation-road, Bristol, Boot and Shoe Maker. March 1. Sol Hobbs, Bank of England Chambers, 18 Broad-st, Bristol.

TUESDAY, Feb. 4, 1862.

Brent, William Brent, Gower-st, Middlesex, and Blackheath Hill, Kent Esq. March 1. Sols Philips & Andrew, 44 Lincoln's-inn-fields, Middlesex.
Cubitt, Honor, Bunch of Grapes Public House, Bermonsey, Surrey, Widow. Feb 20. Sols Ellis, Bannister, & Robinson, Clement's-lane, Lombard-st.
Fennessey, Robert Richard, Lieutenant in her Majesty's 54th Regiment of Foot. March 7. Sols Taylor & Jaquet, 15 South-st, Finsbury-sq, Middlesex.
Grant, Duncan Trevor, formerly of Liverpool, afterwards of Dundalk, Ireland, and Aldershot, Hants, but late of Port Louis, Island of the Mauritius, Major and Barrack Master in her Majesty's service. March 31. Sol Colyer, 3 Furnival's-inn, London.
Watkin, Joseph, Carlton, Rothwell, Yorkshire, Farmer. April 1. Sol Turner, Rothwell.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, Jan. 31, 1862.

Cooper, Alice, Wyboston, Eaton Socon, Bedfordshire, Widow. Feb 25. Cooper & Newman, V. C. Stuart.
Cooper, Ebenezer, Wyboston, Eaton Socon, Bedfordshire, Gardener. Feb 25. Cooper & Handley, V. C. Stuart.
Humbus, Anna Catherine, who died at Bingen, in the year 1813. March 10. Baur & Baur, V. C. Stuart.
Parry, Margaret, Well-st, Nevin, Carnarvonshire, Widow. March 10. Roberts & Parry, V. C. Stuart.
Piselli, Charles, Horton, formerly of Farnfield, Nottinghamshire, but late of Twickenham, Middlesex. Feb 24. Dinsley & Dinsley, V. C. Kildersley.
Ridley, John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Solicitor. Feb 24. Coxon & Ridley, V. C. Wood.
Thompson, Elizabeth, 12 Sidney-pl, Bath, Widow. Feb 25. Jenkins & Thompson, M. R.
Thompson, William Henry, 72, Balaover-st, Portland-pl, Middlesex, Esq. March 9. Thompson & Thompson, V. C. Kildersley.

TUESDAY, Feb. 4, 1862.

Adhead, Ebenezer, 53 Strand, Middlesex, Hostler. Feb 25. Nelson & Bealby, M.R.
Fotheringham, Robert Hamilton, Kingsbridge-house, Southampton. Feb 25. Epton & Fotheringham, V.C. Kildersley.
Jones, Joseph, Ramsey, Huntingdonshire, Farmer. Feb 25. Raynham & Jones, M.R.
Potts, Thomas, Sutton, Cheshire, Gent. Feb 24. Beard & Wile, M.R.
Purdie, James, Everton Village, Lancashire, Gent. March 1. Galsbolli & Purdie, V.C. Stuart.
Rolls, Thomas, 4 Cottage-rd, Fimble, Middlesex, Gent. Feb 25. Rolfe & Rolfe, M.R.

Assignments for Benefit of Creditors.

FRIDAY, Jan. 31, 1862.

Gartherne, George Samuel, & William Dickinson, North Shields, Northumberland, Drapers. Jan 6. Sol Dale, North Shields.
Gleaves, William, Abbotsey, Huntingdonshire, Farmer. Jan 18. Sols Wilkinson & Butler, St. Neot's.

TUESDAY, Feb. 4, 1862.

Balmer, Jonah, Union-ter, York, Sheep Jobber. Jan 27. Sol Phillips, 9 Lendal, York.
Elliott, Frederick, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer. Jan 23. Sols Parsons & Son, Nottingham.

Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, Jan. 31, 1862.

Allison, John, & James John Allison, Sunderland, Corn Factors. Dec 31. Assignment. Reg Jan 28.
Ambridge, Richard Henry, & William White, 123 St John-st, West Smithfield, Middlesex, and of the Corn Exchange, London, Corn Merchants. Jan 20. Assignment. Reg Jan 30.
Birkett, George, Buntingford, Somersetshire, Farmer. Dec 31. Assignment. Reg Jan 31.
Bunyard, Charles, 5 Bucklersbury, London, Merchant. Dec 31. Conveyance. Reg Jan 29.
Butcher, Catherine, Fosters Booth, Pattinall, Northamptonshire, Widow, Innkeeper. Jan 14. Assignment. Reg Jan 29.
Chappell, John, Horbury, Yorkshire, Mungo Manufacturer. Jan 3. Composition. Reg Jan 30.
Charlier, Sarah Elizabeth, 3 Bristol-gardens, Malda-hall, Paddington, Middlesex, Widow. Dec 31. Composition. Reg Jan 29.
Clark, Charles, 182a Oxford-st, Middlesex, Jeweller. Jan 9. Assignment. Reg Jan 27.
Cotter, William, 4 York-rd, King's-cross, Middlesex, Potato Salesman. Jan 14. Composition. Reg Jan 20.
Cox, William, Heckmondwike, Bristol, Yorkshire, Schoolmaster. Jan 25. Composition. Reg Jan 29.
Crampster, Stephen, Lytchett, Matravars, Dorsetshire, Smith. Jan 19. Assignment. Reg Jan 29.
Dalton, John, Firebraceon, Fulston, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Oct 25. Declaration of Trust. Reg Jan 29.

Dean, Elias, Drayton, Berks, Widow. Jan 28. Assignment. Reg Jan 29.
 Englefield, James, jun., Gresham-st, London, Warehouseman. Jan 17.
 Composition. Reg Jan 29.
 Francis, George Richard, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Fishing Merchant.
 Jan 3. Assignment. Reg Jan 30.
 Hanson, William, Richard Hanson, John Hanson, & Joseph Hanson, Skip-
 ton, Yorkshire, Mechanical Engineers. Jan 24. Inspection. Reg
 Jan 27.
 Harling, Daniel, & Thomas Richmond, Bridge End, Habergam, Eaves,
 Burnley, Lancashire, Machine Makers (Daniel Harling & Co.). Jan 6.
 Composition. Reg Jan 28.
 Briggs, Benjamin, Hebbliethwaite, Mirfield, Yorkshire, Malster. Jan 28.
 Composition. Reg Jan 29.
 Hilder, James, Sea Farm, Rye, Sussex, Farmer. Jan 7. Conveyance.
 Reg Jan 29.
 Hopking, Thomas, 3 Updell-row, Kingsland, Middlesex, Draper. Jan 2.
 Composition. Reg Jan 29.
 Hunter, James, Red Deer Public-house, Cambridge-rd, Middlesex, Vic-
 tualler. Jan 3. Assignment. Reg Jan 30.
 Johnson, John, Manchester, Tailor and Draper. Jan 21. Composition.
 Reg Jan 28.
 Lee, Edward, Gorleston, Suffolk, Fishing Merchant. Jan 2. Assignment.
 Reg Jan 28.
 McKune, George, Edmonton, Middlesex, Draper. Jan 6. Assignment.
 Reg Jan 30.
 Norman, Thomas William, Biggin-st, Dover, Baker. Jan 2. Assignment.
 Reg Jan 29.
 Parsons, Charles Frederick, Ship Tavern, Glass house-yard, Aldersgate-
 st, Middlesex, Licensed Victualler. Jan 1. Assignment. Reg Jan 27.
 Ray, William, 90 Lower Thames-st, London, Ship and Insurance Broker.
 Jan 22. Composition. Reg Jan 29.
 Spencer, Charles, 64 Broad-st, Birmingham, Draper. Jan 20. Com-
 position. Reg Jan 28.
 Spencer, Joseph, Edward-street-parade, Birmingham, Draper. Jan 20.
 Composition. Reg Jan 29.
 Shackleton, Robert, Bradford, Innkeeper. Jan 1. Composition. Reg
 Jan 27.
 Stapleton, Henry Fomick, 14 Sykes-ter, Mile End-road, Middlesex, and
 High-st, Stratford, Essex, Ironmonger. Jan 9. Assignment. Reg
 Jan 20.
 Taberner, John Loude, 27 Cornhill, London, Gent. Jan 16. Assignment.
 Reg Jan 28.
 Thomas, Jonathan, Abercandol, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorganshire, Grocer.
 Jan 22. Release. Reg Jan 27.
 Tregear, Mary, Southampton, Her. Dec 30. Assignment. Reg Jan 27.
 Waterworth, Joe Wilkinson, salterhebble, near Halifax, Builder. Jan 1.
 Assignment. Reg Jan 28.
 Wheeler, George, Russell-st, Landport, Hants, Builder. Jan 20. Assign-
 ment. Reg Jan 28.
 Whitaker, Thomas, Talbot-ter, Sheffield, Corn Factor. Jan 25. Assign-
 ment. Reg Jan 29.
 Wilkinson, William, Leake, Lincolnshire, Miller. Jan 1. Assignment,
 Reg Jan 27.
 Winterbottom, Robert, Glossop, Derbyshire, Grocer and Corn Dealer.
 Jan 16. Composition. Reg Jan 29.

TUESDAY, Feb. 4, 1862.

Abrahart, William, London-st, Derby, Tailor. Jan 3. Composition.
 Reg Feb 1.
 Appleby, Henry, & William Appleby, New Invention, Willenhall, Stafford-
 shire, Lock Manufacturers. Jan 8. Assignment. Reg Jan 30.
 Bellamy, Theodora Marianna, Plymouth, Widow. Jan 22. Assignment.
 Reg Feb 3.
 Chadwick, Matthew, Bury, Mill Furnisher. Jan 31. Composition. Reg
 Feb 3.
 Chandler, Jacob Thomas, Staple, Kent, Farmer. Jan 8. Assignment.
 Reg Feb 3.
 Clarke, William, Bourton, Wiltshire, Farmer. Jan 4. Assignment.
 Reg Jan 30.
 Crickett, John, & William Crickett, Margate, Kent, Bathes. Jan 20.
 Assignment. Reg Feb 1.
 Crompton, Ellis, Manchester, Baker and Provision Dealer. Jan 21. Com-
 position. Reg Feb 1.
 Howarth, George, Selby, Yorkshire, Saddler. Jan 4. Assignment. Reg
 Jan 31.
 Kemmish, William James, 8 Bollingbroke-row, Walworth-rd, Surrey, Toy
 Dealer. Jan 30. Composition. Reg Jan 31.
 Livingston, Jane, Dyke-rd, Brighton, Widow and Boarding School Pro-
 prietor. Jan 7. Assignment. Reg Feb 3.
 Maguire, Charles, James Hyde, & William Billing, Manchester, Merchants
 (Maguire, Hyde, & Co.). Jan 21. Assignment. Reg Feb 3.
 Mansbridge, Thomas, Wood-st, London, Warehouseman. Jan 31. Com-
 position. Reg Feb 1.
 Mathews, Thomas, Langley, Warwickshire, Farmer. Jan 2. Assign-
 ment. Reg Jan 30.
 Parr, William, Nottingham, Builder. Jan 6. Assignment. Reg Feb 1.
 Pearson, Joseph, 10 Argyle-st, Bath, Grocer. Jan 11. Assignment.
 Reg Feb 1.
 Rigby, George, Preston, Innkeeper. Jan 6. Assignment. Reg Feb 3.
 Taylor, James, Birmingham, Cabinet Maker. Jan 18. Assignment.
 Reg Feb 1.
 Whear, Mary, & William Whear, Kilkhampton Town, Cornwall, Malsters.
 Jan 9. Assignment. Reg Jan 31.
 Wood, David, Bramley, Leeds, Cloth Manufacturer. Jan 18. Compo-
 sition. Reg Feb 1.

BANKRUPTS.

TUESDAY, Jan. 28, 1862.

Adlard, James, Rose Cottage, Pond-lane, Clapton, Middlesex, Working
 Lithographer. Pet Jan 27. London, Feb 20. Sol Walker, 33 Clem-
 ents-lane.
 Arkill, John, 26A Old Fish-st, Doctors' Commons, London, Green Grocer.
 Pet Jan 25. London, Feb 13. Sol Wright, 123 Chancery-lane.
 Astley, Thomas, 5 Pippin-st, Four Lane-end, within Blackburn, Lan-
 cashire, Brick Maker. Pet Jan 22. Blackburn, Feb 10. Sol Clough,
 Blackburn.
 Baker, Arthur, 38 Gosford-st, Coventry, Butcher. Pet Jan 24. Coventry
 Feb 19. Sol Smallbone, Coventry.

Ball, George, Yorkshire-st, Oldham, Umbrella Maker. Pet Jan 16. Old-
 ham, Feb 13.
 Balmforth, Clarence, 127 Portland-st, Liverpool, Licensed Victualler.
 Pet Jan 24. Liverpool, Feb 10. Sol Blackhurst, Liverpool.
 Barfield, Daniel, Northampton, Boot and Shoe Manufacturer. Pet Jan
 24. London, Feb 12. Sols Metcalfe, 4 Farnival's-inn, and Becke,
 Northampton.
 Batho, William, & Daniel Jones, Wrexham, Denbighshire, Brewers: Pet
 Jan 24. Liverpool, Feb 10. Sol Rymer, Liverpool.
 Beard, William, 5 Robert's-pl, Brunswick-st, Dover-rd, Borough, Surrey,
 Tailor. Pet Jan 22. London, Feb 11. Sol Angell, 23 King-st, Cheap-
 side.
 Beecher, James William, 53 & 186 Brick-lane, Spitalfields, Middlesex,
 Tailor. Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 12. Sol Waring, 25 Poultry.
 Bilham, Robert Thomas, Aldeburgh, Suffolk. Pet Jan 22. Framling-
 ham, Feb 17. Sol Culley, Norwich.
 Bishop, Charles, Red Lion Inn, Bitterne, Hants, Plumber. Pet Jan 23.
 London, Feb. Sols Paterson & Son, 7 Bouverie-st, and Mackey,
 Southampton.
 Bright, Joseph, Boston, Porter, Great Northern Railway. Pet Jan 27.
 London, Feb 14. Sols Steele & Co., 44 Bloomsbury-sq.
 Brown, Aaron, West Shefford, Berkshire, Baker. Pet Jan 20. London,
 Feb 14. Sol Pook, Basinghall-st.
 Bryant, Wrightson Robert, 7 Selwood-pl, Brompton, Middlesex. Pet Jan
 23 (in forma pauperis). London, Feb 12. Sols Fenton & Son, Bevois-
 ct, Basinghall-st.
 Castle, Henry, Wantage, Berkshire, Innkeeper. Pet Jan 23. London,
 Feb 19. Sols Ford & Lloyd, 4 Bloomsbury-sq, and Bartlett, Abingdon.
 Cave, John, jun., Spalding, Lincoln, Gardener. Pet Jan 24. Birming-
 ham, Feb 13. Sols Maples & Son, Spalding, and Hawkridge & Heath-
 cote, Nottingham.
 Chapman, James, Brentwood, Essex, Blacksmith. Pet Jan 22. London,
 Feb 12. Sols Preston & Dorman, 13 Gresham-st.
 Chandry, John Godfrey, & Henry Harris Chaundy, Muswell-hill, Boar-
 stall, Buckinghamshire, Cattle and Sheep Dealers. Pet Jan 20. Lon-
 don Feb 14. Sols Chilton & Co., 35 Chancery-lane.
 Cleeton, Thomas, Leigh Sinton, Leigh, Worcestershire, Butcher. Pet Jan
 23. Birmingham, Feb 7. Sol Corlies, Worcester.
 Cobbett, William, Battersea-park, Surrey. Adj Jan 18. London, Feb 11.
 Coldwell, William Lawrence, 88 Chalton-st, Somers Town, Middlesex,
 Baker. Pet Jan 24 (in forma pauperis). London, Feb 11. Sol Silves-
 ter, 15 Great Dover-st, Surrey.
 Cole, William, Northgate-st, Gloucester, Tailor. Pet Jan 24. Glouc-
 ester, Feb 8. Sol Wilkes, Gloucester.
 Cooper, Samuel, 34 Back Water-st, Manchester, Leather Cutter. Pet
 Jan 25. Salford, Feb 15. Sol Baker, Manchester.
 Cooke, William, Silsoe, Bedfordshire, Shopkeeper. Jan 17. Bedford,
 Feb 7.
 Cookes, Edward, 67 Ruston-st North, Birmingham. Pet Jan 23. Birm-
 ingham, Feb 14. Sol Allen, Moor-st.
 Corney, John, Stockton-st, West Hartlepool, Journeyman Painter. Pet
 Jan 24. Hartlepool, Feb 3. Sol Marshall, West Hartlepool.
 Davies, Benjamin, Old Lion Inn, King-st, Fombroke, Builder. Pet Jan
 25. Pembroke, Feb 17. Sol Parry, Pembroke.
 Davies, Evan, Newport, Monmouthshire, Ship Owner. Pet Jan 24. Bris-
 tol, Feb 14. Sol Cathcart, Newport.
 Davies, John, High-st, Homerton, Middlesex, Butcher. Pet Jan 25. Lon-
 don, Feb 12. Sol De Medina, 14 St Benet's-pl, Gracechurch-st.
 Davies, Richard, Peterchurch, Herefordshire, Licensed Victualler. Pet
 Jan 23. Birmingham, Feb 10. Sols Hodgson & Son, Birmingham.
 Dear, Nathaniel, 5 College-grove, Camden Town, Middlesex, Carpenter.
 Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 20. Sol Ablett, 6 Newcastle-st, Strand.
 Dennis, Samuel, Rayleigh, Essex, Carpenter. Jan 22. London, Feb 12.
 Destin, Thomas, Bay View House, Paignton, Devonshire, Builder. Pet
 (in forma pauperis). Totnes, Feb 10.
 Drew, John, 13 Took's-ct, Curator-st, Chancery-lane, Middlesex, Law
 Stationer. Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 12. Sol Holt, Quality-ct, Chan-
 cery-lane.
 Edkins, Thomas, 1 Wood-st, Stratford-on-Avon, Currier. Pet Jan 25.
 Stratford-on-Avon, Feb 10. Sol Griffin, Leamington.
 Ferris, John, 5 Hillgrove-bldgs, Whitehouse-st, Westminster, Bristol.
 Pet Jan 33. Bristol, Feb 7. Sol Williams.
 Garner, Thomas, jun., 14 John-st, Holland-st, Blackfriars-rd, Baker. Pet
 Jan 25. London, Feb 11. Sol Chipperfield, 3 Trinity-st, Southwark.
 Genner, Enoch, & Elijah Genner, Aqueduct, Madeley, Soap, Soap
 Bollers. Pet Jan 20. Madeley, Feb 15. Sol Beeston, Wellington,
 Shropshire.
 Glasscock, John Thomas, 37 Long Fellow-rd, Mile End, Middlesex, Corn
 Dealer. Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 11. Sols Preston & Dorman, 13
 Gresham-st.
 Goodyear, Holroyd, Brighouse, Halifax, Quarryman. Pet Jan 24. Halli-
 fax, Feb 14. Sols Ingram & Baines, Halifax.
 Griffiths, John, Kingston, Herefordshire, Butcher. Pet Jan 25. Kingston,
 Feb 9. Sol Cheese, Kingston.
 Hammond, George, 18 & 19, King's-row, Walworth, Surrey, Builder.
 Pet Jan 27. London, Feb 20. Sol Gower, 40 King William-st, London.
 Hardy, John Francis, Ilkeston, Derbyshire, Draper's Assistant. Pet Jan
 24. Belper, Feb 11. Sol Lees, Nottingham.
 Harman, Catherine, & William Hurstone, 1 Robert-st, Vine-st, Waterlo-
 rd, Surrey, Surgical Instrument Makers. Pet Jan 25. London Feb 12.
 Sol Stopher, Coleman-st.
 Harris, Anthony, Leckhampton, near Cheltenham, Market Gardener.
 Pet Jan 24. Cheltenham, Feb 11. Sol Wilkes, Gloucester.
 Hart, Mark, Great Ellingham, Norfolk, Higlier. Pet Jan 23. Attle-
 borough, Feb 6. Sol Walpole, Northwold.
 Hayter, Thomas Corvettus, Shaftesbury, Coach Builder. Pet Jan 25.
 London, Feb 12. Sol Drew, 4 New Basinghall-st.
 Haxworth, Arthur, Suffolk Coffee House, Holborn, Middlesex, Pet Jan 24.
 (in forma pauperis). London, Feb 20. Sol Holt, Quality-ct.
 Hayward, Francis Moreau, 32 George-st, Hanover-sq, Middlesex, Dentist.
 Pet Jan 18. London, Feb 12. Sol Chedley, 25 Old Jewry.
 Hayward, Philip (not Haywood as before advertised).
 Heaven, Edwin, 21 Old Bowell-ct, Strand, Middlesex, Builder. Pet Jan
 23. London, Feb 12. Sol Appleyard, 10 Symonds-inn.
 Hanson, John (not Honors as before advertised), jun., Keresley, near
 Coventry, Blacksmith. Pet Jan 20. Coventry, Feb 19. Sol Griffin,
 Leamington.

Heyworth, John, Paddock, Huddersfield, Scribbler. Pet Jan 23. Huddersfield, Feb 13. Sol Freeman.

Hill, Richard Harris, Kirkby Lonsdale, Westmorland, Stationer. Pet Jan 24. Kirkby Lonsdale, Feb 12. Sol Pearson, Kirkby Lonsdale.

Hines, Henry Augustus, 48 Clifford-st., Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Manchester. Pet Jan 22. Manchester, Feb 25. Sol Ambler, Manchester.

Hirst, John, & Charles Day, Aspley, Huddersfield, Cloth Millers. Pet Jan 22. Huddersfield, Feb 13. Sol Dransfield, Huddersfield.

Hobbs, John, Plough and Barleycorn Brewery, Landport, Hants. Pet Jan 22. Portsmouth, Feb 10. Sol Paffard, Jun, Portsea.

Hobson, James, High-st., Kedgrove, Staffordshire, Journeyman Glasier. Pet Jan 24. Hanley, Feb 5. Sol Tomkinson, Burslem.

Holmes, Biyeth, York-st., Nottingham, Brail and Elastic Web Manufacturer. Pet Jan 24. Nottingham, Feb 5. Sol Smith, Nottingham.

Hopkins, Joseph Frederick, Buckhurst-hill, Chigwell, Essex, Schoolmaster. Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 20. Sols Thomas & Hollins, Mincing-lane.

Hughes, Alexander, 6 High-st., Stoke Newington, Middlesex, Draper. Pet Jan 23. London, Feb 12. Sol Catlin, 22 Ely-pl.

Hughes, Humphrey, 8 Lansdown-ter., East Kensington, Middlesex, Schoolmaster. Pet Jan 25. London, Feb 19. Sol Weeks, 1 Falcon-sq.

Hulme, William, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Hay and Straw Dealer. Pet Jan 23. Newcastle-under-Lyme, Feb 13. Sol Litchfield.

Hunt, William, 6 William-st., Lison-grove, Marylebone, Middlesex, Green-grocer. Pet Jan 27 (in forma pauperis). London, Feb 20.

James, David, Bridgnorth, Salopshire, Innkeeper. Jan 17. Bridgnorth, Feb 3. Sol Stokes, Dudley.

Keyworth, John, St Ann's Well-rd., Nottingham, Fish Salesman, Pet Jan 23. Nottingham, Feb 5. Sol Brown, Nottingham.

Lambert, Henry, Yorkford, Suffolk, Thatcher. Pet Jan 22. Halesworth, Feb 11. Sols Moseley & Massey, Framlingham.

Lemon, Thomas, Duke-st., Cardiff, Machine Manufacturer. Pet Jan 21 (in forma pauperis). Cardiff, Feb 10. Sol Wilcocks, Cardiff.

Malpas, James, 3 Shorter's-ct., Throgmorton-st., London, Stockbroker. Pet Jan 23. London, Feb 19. Sol Parkes, 11 Beaumont-bldgs.

Mann, Henry, Church-rd., Nechells, Birmingham, Carrier. Pet Jan 23. Birmingham, Feb 10. Sol Parry, Birmingham.

Mennen, John, 1 Bucklersbury, London, Merchant. Pet Jan 16. London, Feb 11. Sol Bailey, 8 Tokenhouse-yd.

Miles, Edward, Huntingfield, Suffolk, Wheelwright. Pet Jan 24. Halesworth, Feb 11. Sols Moseley & Massey, Framlingham.

Miller, William, Christchurch, Hants. Adj. London, Feb 19.

Mogg, John, 9 Lower-st., Lower-rd., Islington, Middlesex, Grocer. Pet Jan 23. London, Feb 11. Sol Buchanan, 13 Basinghall-st.

Morris, Vincent, Blyth Livery Stables, Hammersmith Gate, Riding Master. Pet Jan 23. London, Feb 12. Sol Mayhew, 21 Carey-st.

Mould, Nicholas, 1 Princess-st., Plaistow, Marsh, Essex, Licensed Victualler. Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 12. Sol Unell, 15 Clifford's-inn.

Mundy, Alfred, 97 Goswell-st., Clerkenwell, Middlesex, Dairyman. Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 12. Sol Marshall, Hatton-garden.

Nash, Henry, 5 Etham-pl., Kent-st., Southwark, Surrey, Grocer. Pet Jan 23. London, Feb 11. Sol Swan, 2 Great Knight Rider st., Doctor's-commons.

Ockerby, Horatio, 21 Castle-st., Holborn, London, and 3 Victoria-terrace, Counter-hill, New-crown, Kent, Law Stationer. Pet Jan 23 (in forma pauperis). London, Feb 20. Sols Fenton & Son, Basinghall-st.

Oliver, James, Jun., 14 High-st., St. John's-wood, Middlesex, Plumber. Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 12. Sol Herring, Stafford-st., Marylebone-rd.

Paine, Henry, 234 Strand, Middlesex, Tailor. Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 13. Sol Drew, 4 New Basinghall-st.

Parkin, Charles, Hightown, Birstall, Yorkshire, Chemist. Pet Jan 24. Leeds, Feb 17. Sol Harle, Leeds.

Phillips, William, 7 Abington-bldgs, Walcot, Bath, Victualler. Pet Jan 24. Bristol, Feb 10. Sols Dowding & Burne, Bath.

Pycroft, James Wallis, Iwer, Bucks. Adj Jan 18. London, Feb 11.

Rackstaff, Philip Burnstead, 16 Surrey-sq., Old Kent-rd., Surrey, Fish Salesman. Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 12. Sols Peck & Downing, 10 Basinghall-st.

Reeves, Amos, West Hill Lime Works, Dartford, Kent, Lime Burner. Adj Jan 20. London, Feb 19.

Reid, James Croft, 99 Spencer-st., Everton, Liverpool, Steam Tug Boat Proprietor. Pet Jan 4. Liverpool, Feb 16. Sols Anderson & Collins, Liverpool.

Reynolds, William, West-st., Well-st., South Hackney, Middlesex, Liquid Carmine Manufacturer. Pet Jan 25. London, Feb 12. Sols Marshall & Son, 13 Hatton-garden.

Richards, James Hawkins, 20 Havant-st., Portsea, Builder. Jan 27. London, Feb 19. Sol Jones, 5 New-inn, Stand, and Paffard, Portsea.

Robinson, Matthew, Darlington, Commission Agent. Jan 15. Feb 11. Sol Webster, Darlington.

Rockliffe, John Lee, Denton near Manchester, Commission Agent. Jan 14. Manchester, Feb 20. Sol Swan, Manchester.

Rogers, Thomas, Kingswood-hill, Oldland, Gloucestershire, Beer Retailer. Pet Jan 23. Bristol, Feb 7. Sols Clifton & Benson.

Seally, George, Redland, Bristol, Clerk. Pet Jan 22. Bristol, Feb 7. Sol Harris.

Seavers, William, Joseph-st., Leeds-rd., Bradford, Wheelwright. Pet Jan 23. Bradford, Feb 10. Sol Hutchinson, Bradford.

Singer, Henry, Westerham, Kent, Builder. Jan 20. London, Feb 12.

Skidding, Charles, Quarry Bank, Kingswinford, Staffordshire, Pet Jan 23. Stourbridge, Feb 17. Sol Maltby, Dudley.

Smith, Isaac, 8 Ryder-st., Bradford, Mechanic. Jan 21. Manchester, Feb 25. Sol Foster, Manchester.

Smith, John, Chalk-farm, Caddington, Beds, Farmer and Bailiff. Pet Jan 23. Luton, Feb 8. Sol Bailey, Luton.

Smoker, Thomas, 1444 Tooley-st., Southwark, Surrey, Tobacconist. Pet Jan 23. London, Feb 24. Sol Philipps, 20 Coleman-st.

Soul, Caleb, 85 Queen-st., Chesapeake, London, Manufacturing Perfumer. Pet Jan 17. London, Feb 11. Sols Lofly, Potter, & Son, 36 King-st., London.

Spencer, William, Epsom and Dorking, Surrey, Draper. Pet Jan 17. London, Feb 19. Sols Davidson, Bradbury, & Hardwick, 23 Basinghall-st.

Sproston, William, 24 Love-lane, Eastcheap, London, Wholesale Fishmonger. Pet Jan 23. London, Feb 10. Sol Bastard, 25 Philipot-lane.

Stone, John, Sidmouth, Bosc and Shoe Maker. Pet Jan 24. Honiton, Feb 7. Sol Tweed, Honiton.

Sturge, Henry, 8 Westgate-bldgs, Bath, Musical Instrument Maker. Jan 22. Bath, Feb 11. Sol Bartrum, Bath.

Thomas, Henry, 7 Station-st., Aberdare, Glamorganshire, Painter. Pet Jan 23. Aberdare, Feb 15. Sol Forwood, Merthyr Tydfil.

Thomas, Thomas Edward, Bull Inn, Glow-hill, St Woolos, Monmouthshire, Innkeeper. Pet Jan 24. Bristol, Feb 14. Sol Cathcart, Newport.

Thompson, William, Thompson-st., Stranton, Durham, Joiner. Pet Jan 16. Hartlepool, Feb 3. Sol Marshall, West Hartlepool.

Thorman, Robert Charles, Bromley Palace, High-st., Bromley, Middlesex, Plumber. Pet Jan 23. London, Feb 20. Sols Fenton & Son, Bevois-ct., Basinghall-st.

Tison, George, 35 Goldsmiths-pl., Goldsmiths-row, Hackney-rd., Middlesex, and 4 & 25 Daniel-st., Gosset-st., Middlesex. Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 11.

Turpin, William, 16 Drake-st., Plymouth, Commercial Traveller. Pet Jan 14 (in forma pauperis). Feb 8.

Vaughan, William, Crewe-green, Albury, Salop, Shoe Maker. Pet Jan 23. Shrewsbury, Feb 10. Sol Davies, Shrewsbury.

Vincent, William Edward, Chard, Innkeeper. Pet Jan 20. Chard, Feb 3. Sol Saul, Ilminster.

Ward, James, Birmingham, Iron Merchant. Pet Jan 25. Birmingham, Feb 10. Sol Suckling, Birmingham.

Wardle, Thomas Henry, 184, Lee Bank-rd., Birmingham, Commission Agent. Jan 21. Birmingham, Feb 14.

Walker, John, Brinklow, Warwickshire, Blacksmith. Pet Jan 21. Rugby, Feb 7. Sol Smallbone, Coventry.

Wallis, John, Pembrey, Kent, Farmer. Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 20. Sols Harrison & Lewis, 6 Old Jewry.

West, Joseph, 145 Aldersgate-st., London, Builder. Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 12. Sol Brown, 21 Finsbury-place.

Whiteman, Charles, Wanborough, Wilts, Carrier. Pet Jan 22. Bristol, Feb 10. Sols Kinneir, Swindon, and Prideaux, Bristol.

Wilkinson, Charles Hennell, Pelham-villas, Brompton, Middlesex. Pet Jan 23 (in forma pauperis). Feb 12. Sols Fenton and Son, Bevois-ct., Basinghall-st.

Williams, George, 64 College-st., Brompton, Middlesex, Foreman of Iron Works. Pet Jan 27. London, Feb 19. Sol Allen, 64 Chancery-lane.

Wills, James, Denham-ter., Plymouth, Auctioneer. Pet Jan 14 (in forma pauperis). East Stonehouse, Feb 8.

Wolf, William, Carlton Scroop, Lincolnshire, Commercial Traveller. Pet Jan 21. Grantham, Feb 11. Sol Brown, Lincoln.

Wright, Thomas, 47 Sloane-sq., Chelsea, Builder. Pet Jan 23. London, Feb 13. Sol Neate, 14 Southampton-bldgs.

FRIDAY, JAN. 31, 1862.

Adams, Alfred, Alstone Field, Staffordshire, Miller. Pet Jan 27. Birmingham, Feb 10. Sol Hacker & Bloore, Leek, and James & Knight, Birmingham.

Ahmady, Christopher Bigby, 108 Regent-st., Middlesex, Jan 18. London, Feb 14. Sol Aldridge, Moorgate-st.

Allan, William, 55 Newgate-st., Bishop Auckland, Fruiterer. Pet Jan 22. Bishop Auckland, Feb 13. Sol Prond, Bishop Auckland.

Andrews, David, Markyate-st., Caddington, Herts, Tailor. Pet Jan 29. Luton, Feb 13. Sol Shepherd, Luton.

Ashwin, James, sen. 19 Church-st., Lonsell, Aston, Warwickshire, Estate Agent. Pet Jan 27. Birmingham, Feb 14. Sol Parry, Birmingham.

Aubrey, Thomas, Caledonian Inn, High-st., Merthyr Tydfil, Licensed Victualler. Pet Jan 23. Merthyr Tydfil, Feb 13. Sol Forwood, Merthyr Tydfil.

Baker, Joseph, Birmingham, Surveyor. Pet Jan 29. Birmingham, Feb 17. Sols James & Knight, Birmingham.

Barratt, Christopher, Loughborough, Grocer. Pet Jan 25. Nottingham, Feb 12. Sol Giles, Loughborough.

Barrow, Thomas, Thomas-st., Bristol, Licensed Victualler. Pet Jan 29. Bristol, Feb 10. Sols Clifton & Benson.

Bartholomew, George, 55 Lavender-st., Brighton, Sussex, Beer Retailer. Pet Jan 27. Feb 18. Sol Goodman, Brighton.

Beardmore, Rosanna, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Widow and Confectioner. Pet Jan 29. Birmingham, Feb 17. Sols James & Knight, Birmingham.

Bennet, Richard Greenwood, 13 Millbay-rd., Plymouth, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Jan 29. East Stonehouse, Feb 15. Sol Gidley, Plymouth.

Bogg, William, & Stephen Clayton, Scarborough, Grocers. Pet Jan 23. Scarborough, Feb 18. Sols Heep & Moody, Scarborough.

Bowdon, John, Harford-st., Bristol, Cabinet Maker. Pet Jan 27. Bristol, Feb 14. Sols Clifton & Benson, Bristol.

Bowler, Joseph, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, Builder. Pet Jan 17. London, Feb 19. Sols Grenville & Tucker, 23 St. Swithin's-lane.

Brotherton, Richard, Black Boy Inn-yd., Newgate-st., Bishop Auckland, Painter. Pet Jan 22. Bishop Auckland, Feb 13. Sol Prond, Bishop Auckland.

Brown, Aaron, West Sheffield, Berks, Baker. Pet Jan 20. London, Feb 14. Sols Pook, Basinghall-st., and Cave, Newbury.

Brown, George, New Thornley, Durham, Black and White Smith. Pet Jan 23. Durham, Feb 11. Sol Marshall, Durham.

Brown, Henry Kittler, 75 Carlisle-st., St. Mary's, Lambeth, Surrey, Assistant Door-keeper at the House of Lords. Pet Jan 22. London, Feb 11. Sol Steadman, 27 Essex-st., Strand.

Brown, John, Burslem, Staffordshire, General Broker. Pet Jan 20. Hanley, Feb 22. Sol Twigg, Burslem.

Brown, Thomas William, Kingston-upon-Hull, Oil Merchant. Pet. Leeds, Feb 12. Sol Pettingill, Hull.

Brown, William, Burslem, Staffordshire, Potter. Pet Jan 25. Birmingham, Feb 14. Sols Treherne & Wolfershan, 17 Gresham-st.

Campling, Robert Augustus, formerly of Streteford, Lancashire, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Jan 27. Salford, Feb 10. Sol Elliott, Manchester.

Cantor, Jacob, 4 Great Dover-st., Saint Mary, Newington, Surrey, Watch and Clock Maker. Pet Jan 29. London, Feb 14. Sol Silvester, 18 Great Dover-st.

Carter, George Charles, Farnborough, Wheelwright. Pet Jan 27. Farnham, Feb 11. Sol White, Guildford.

Chadaway, Charles, Skerchley, Leicestershire, Timber Merchant. Pet Jan 27. Birmingham, Feb 10. Sol Duke, Birmingham.

Challenger, John Henry, 20 Upper Cleveland-st., Fitzroy-sq., Middlesex, Journeyman Pianoforte Maker. Pet Jan 23. London, Feb 14. Sol Wright, 123 Chancery-lane.

Charles, Thomas Frederick, 27 Davies-st., Berkeley-sq., Middlesex, Watch-maker. Pet Jan 27. London, Feb 14. Sol Abrahams, 17 Gresham-st.

Cherry, Thomas, Beccles, Suffolk, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Jan 23. Beccles, Feb 11. Sol Kent, Beccles.

Chubb, John, Over Wallop, Southampton; Farm Bailiff. Jan 21. London, Feb 11.

Cobb, Marius Thomas, 202 Bute-rd., Cardiff, Retailer of Cigars. Pet Jan 26. Cardiff, Feb 17. Sol Bird, Cardiff.

Coles, John Augustus, 29 Sherbourne-st., Downham-rd., Islington, Middlesex, Fret Cutter. Pet Jan 27. London, Feb 19. Sol Heathfield, Lincoln's-inn-fields, London.

Cooper, William, Saint Giles-st., Oxford, Innkeeper. Pet Jan 25. London, Feb 11. Sols Parker, Rooke, & Parker, 17 Bedford-row, Tod Dudley, Oxford.

Corbett, Henry, 101 Bath-row, and 32 Summer-row, Birmingham, Fire Brick Manufacturer. Pet Jan 27. Birmingham, Feb 14. Sol Smith, Birmingham.

Cox, Edward, Letcomb Regis, Berks, Trainer of Greyhounds. Pet Jan 24. Wantage, Feb 17. Sol Mantell, Farringdon.

Crabtree, Hannah, Belton, Lincolnshire, Widow and Grocer. Pet Jan 21. Thorne, Feb 12. Sols Beckill & Phillips, Thorne.

Daniels, Nathaniel, 50 Pembridge-villas, Bayswater, Middlesex, late of 36 Threadneedle-st., London, Merchant. Pet Jan 30. London, Feb 19. Sols Harrison & Lewis, Old Jewry.

Darwin, David, Hope-st., Blaine, Monmouthshire, Plumber. Pet Jan 27. Tredegar, Feb 15. Sol Harris, Tredegar.

Denham, William Thomas, 18 Wilmingdon-sq., Clerkenwell, Middlesex, Fancy Trimming Manufacturer. Pet Jan 27. London, Feb 19. Sol Cooke, 24 Duckersbury.

Dicken, Joseph, Victoria-rd., Ealing, Middlesex, Builder. Jan 20. London, Feb 23.

Dugdale, John Whitte Edmunds, 195 Commercial-rd., Landport, Hants' Bookseller. Pet Jan 28. Portsmouth, Feb 15. Sol Constans, Portsea.

Elliston, Nutter, Southampton, Oil and Colour Merchant. Pet Jan 29. London, Feb 20. Sols Paterson and Son, 7 Boulevard-st., and Mackay, Southampton.

Evans, Morgan, Llaneglwys Ucha, Gwenddwr, Brecknockshire, Farmer. Pet Jan 27. Bristol, Feb 18. Sols Bishop, Brecon, and Bevan, Gilling, & Press, Bristol.

Farr, John, Madeley, Salop, Blacksmith. Pet Jan 28. Madeley, Feb 15. Sol Bartlett, Worcester.

Fazlillo, David, 33 Westmoreland-st., Fimlico, Middlesex, Builder. Pet Jan 28. London, Feb 21. Sol Bartley, 4 Bartlett's-bldgs, Holborn.

Fiddes, Thomas Dunwell, 39 Aldermanbury, London, Manufacturer of Linen Goods. Pet Jan 29 (in form pauperis). London, Feb 14. Sol Fenton, Basinghall-st.

Flynn, William, 30 Adam-st., Cardiff, Draper. Pet Jan 24. Bristol, Feb 17. Sol Henderson, Bristol.

Ford, William Barton (and not William Barton Ford, as previously advertised).

Forster, Charles Fenwick, 8 Kensington-park-ter North, Notting-hill, Middlesex, and 1 Mumford-st., Milk-st., London, Traveller for a Wholesale Alpaca Warehouse. Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 19. Sol Eyre, 23 Foultry.

Gamble, William Norman, Park Nook, Derbyshire, Farmer. Pet Jan 28. Nottingham, Feb 12. Sols Baker & Moody, Derby.

Giles, Thomas, & John Giles, 43 Regent-st., Plymouth, Upholsterers. Pet Jan 28. East Stonehouse, Feb 15. Sols Begg & Rundle, Devonport.

Gore, Samuel, Park-rd., Old Kent-rd., Surrey, Engineer. Jan 18. London, Feb 21.

Green, William, Church-st., Trowbridge, Licensed to let Horses. Pet Jan 28. Trowbridge, Feb 13. Sol Bartrum, Trowbridge.

Harding, William, Leiston, Suffolk, Baker and Confectioner. Pet Jan 27. London, Feb 21. Sols Shirrett & Son, 7 Lincoln's-inn-fields, and Polard, Ipswich.

Hasley, Samuel, Saxsext-rd., South-rd., Forest-hill, Kent, and Upper Thames-rd., London, General Merchant. Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 19. Sol Buchanan, 13 Basinghall-st.

Heworth, Thomas Banon, Mablegate, Leeds, Builder. Pet Jan 20. Leeds, Feb 12. Sol Simpson.

Holls, William James, West Cowes, Isle of Wight, Baker. Jan 21. London, Feb 19. Sol Holt, Quality-st.

Hough, Samuel, 150 Spring-hill, Birmingham, & Richard James, 47, Ingleby-ct., Birmingham, Wiretwrights and Blacksmiths (Hough & James). Pet Jan 25. Birmingham, Feb 14. Sol Allen, Birmingham.

Inman, Joseph Thomas, 65 Stanhope-st., Hampstead-rd., Middlesex, Surveyor and Valuer. Pet Jan 25. London, Feb 19. Sol Renner, 29 Bedford-row.

Jackson, William, Black Bull-yd., Lands-lane, Leeds, Chimney Sweeper. Pet Jan 21. Leeds, Feb 13. Sol Harle.

Jones, Margaret, Cefnwgiddi, Cardiganshire, Widow. Pet Jan 29. Bristol, Feb 14. Sols Lloyd, Lampeter, and Abbott, Lucas, & Leonard, Bristol.

Kavanagh, John, 81 Paradise-st., Liverpool, Solicitor for a Boarding House Keeper. Pet Jan 29. Liverpool, Feb 12. Sol Blackhurst, Liverpool.

Latham, Charles Fast Retford, Nottinghamshire, Coal Dealer. Pet Jan 22. Thorne, Feb 12. Sol Smith & Atkinson, Doncaster.

Lindley, Ralph, Sutton, Cheshire, Licensed Victualler. Pet. Macclesfield, Feb 11. Sol Cooper, Congleton.

Lowett, Daniel, Napthill, Hinghamdon, Buckinghamshire, Builder. Pet Jan 28. High Wycombe, Feb 17. Sol Clark, High Wycombe.

Mackay, Charles, Henry, Marlow, Buckinghamshire. Pet Jan 27. London, Feb 18. Sol Empton, 61 Moorgate-st.

McKenzie, Samuel, Liverpool, Builder. Pet Jan 29. Liverpool, Feb 12. Sols Owen & Meace, Liverpool.

Midgley, Joseph, 180 Great Dover-st., Dover-rd., Borough, Surrey, Clerk to a Commission Agent. Pet Jan 28. London, Feb 11. Sol Munday, 6 Essex-st., Strand.

Miller, James, Stowell, Somersetshire, Innkeeper. Pet. Wincanton, Feb 18. Sol Bick, Braton.

Motterhead, Joseph, Park-green, Macclesfield, Coal Dealer. Macclesfield, Feb 13. Sol Cooper, Congleton.

Moulton, Robert James, St Mary's-rd., Southampton, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Jan 27. Southampton, Feb 22. Sol Mackay, Southampton.

Mundy, George, High-st., Winchester, General Dealer. Pet Jan 28. London, Feb 18. Sols Lawrence, Piewa, & Boyer, 14 Old Jewry-chambers.

Nyers, Henry, Sheffield, Ironmonger. Pet Jan 29. Leeds, Feb 15. Sol Barry, Birmingham.

Onion, Thomas Robert, 102 Aldersgate-st., London, Coach Laco Manufacturer. Pet Jan 23 (in form pauperis). London, Feb 19. Sol Fenton, Boring-ct., Basinghall-st.

Parker, George, 6 Albany-st., Regent's-park, Middlesex, Provision Dealer. Pet Jan 27. London, Feb 18. Sol Leader, 26, Newman-st., Oxford-st.

Pennam, Edward, Redruth, Cornwall, Draper. Pet Jan 27. Redruth, Feb 12. Sol Downing, Redruth.

Peveral, George, Sunderland, Ship Builder. Pet Jan 27. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Feb 12. Sol Ritson, Sunderland.

Pidley, John Gallimore, Newport, near Barnstaple. Pet Jan 29. Exeter, Feb 14. Sol Terrel, Exeter.

Pitchford, William Henry, Oaken-gates, Woombridge, Salop, Blacksmith. Pet Jan 25. Wellington, Feb 14. Sol James, Wellington.

Powell, Jacob, Clothier's Arms Public-house, Llangastock, Brecknockshire, Licensed Victualler. Pet Jan 27. Bristol, Feb 18. Sols Blosay, Brecon, and Bevan, Gilling, & Press, Bristol.

Price, William, Narbeth, Pembrokeshire, Druggist. Pet Jan 17. Bristol, Feb 11. Sols Davies, Haverfordwest, and Brittan & Son, Bristol.

Randle, William Henry, Kenilworth, Plumber. Jan 21. Warwick, Feb 10.

Roxbee, William, 9 Highfield-pl., Irving-st., Birmingham, Whip Maker. Pet Jan 28. Birmingham, Feb 14. Sol East, Birmingham.

Samson, Robert, Washington-st., Worthington, Cumberland, Builder. Pet Jan 27. Cockermouth, Feb 15. Sol Hayton, Cockermouth.

Sears, William, Clay-cross, Derbyshire, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Jan 28. Chesterfield, Feb 14. Sol Walker, Belper.

Simpkin, John William, Garforth, Wholesale Druggist. Pet Jan 23. Leeds, Feb 13. Sol Simpson, Leeds.

Smith, Richard, Mill-st., Leek, Staffordshire, Innkeeper. Pet Jan 27. Leek, Feb 11. Sol Tennant, Hanley.

Smith, Thomas, Bridlesmith-gate, Nottingham, Beer-house Keeper. Pet Jan 26. Nottingham, Feb 13. Sols Hawkridge & Heathcote, Nottingham.

Smith, Timothy, Melville-rd., Kingsley Estate, Malden, Journeyman Plasterer. Pet Jan 25. London, Feb 13. Sols Doyle, 2 Vauxhall-bldgs, Gray's-inn, and Morgan, Malden.

Spyer, Sydney John, 27b Old Bond-st., Middlesex, Attorney-at-Law and Solicitor. Pet Jan 27 (in form pauperis), London, Feb 18. Sol Lewis, 2 Raymond-bldgs, Gray's-inn.

Staples, Ann, Caning-st., Nottingham, Leather Cutter. Pet Jan 28. Nottingham, March 3. Sol Smith, Nottingham.

Stott, Frederick Ralph, Quarry-hill, Leeds, Engineer. Pet Jan 27. Leeds, Feb 17. Sol Harle, Leeds.

Stubbings, Samuel, Sawston, Cambridgeshire, Publican. Pet Jan 27. Cambridge, Feb 13. Sol Wayman, Cambridge.

Stubbs, Maria, Huddersfield, Shoemaker. Pet Jan 27. Leeds, Feb 13. Sol Mason, York.

Sykes, John, Reddy, Lincolnshire, Tailor. Pet Jan 24. Thorne, Feb 12. Sol Marra, Doncaster.

Tate, Robert, Greenway, Hillingdon, Middlesex, Corn Salesman. Pet Jan 27. London, Feb 21. Sol Berry, 27 Bucklersbury.

Taylor, John, River-st., Hulme, Manchester, Grocer. Pet Jan 28. Manchester, Feb 13. Sol Gardner, Manchester.

Taylor, Joseph, Kirton, Lincolnshire, Brewer. Pet Jan 8. Kingston-upon-Hull, Feb 12. Sols Shackles & Son, Hull.

Tuke, Frederick, Bradford, Insurance and General Agent. Pet Jan 30. Leeds, Feb 12. Sols Cross, Bradford, and Barry & Tompsett, Leeds.

Ulyatt, Thomas, Nison, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Pet Jan 23. Doncaster, Feb 11. Sol Smith, Doncaster.

Vaughan, Theophilus, Capa Inn, Charles-st., Dowla, Glamorganshire, Licensed Victualler. Pet Jan 28. Merthyr Tydfil, Feb 13. Sol Forwood, Merthyr Tydfil.

Wakinsaw, James Featonby, 8 West Sycamore-st., Scotswood-rd., Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Engineer's Clerk. Pet Jan 29. Newcastle, Feb 13. Sol Branswell, Newcastle.

Wallis, James John, Victoria-grove, Chelsea, Middlesex, East India Agent. Pet Jan 29. London, Feb 18. Sols Le Blanc, Smales & Torr, 18 New Bridge-st., Blackfriars.

Wallis, Walter Edward, Brentwood, Essex, Baker and Confectioner. Pet Jan 24. London, Feb 11. Sols Preston & Dorman, 13 Gresham-st., London.

Walters, George, 9 East-st., Bedminster, Bristol, Tin Plate Worker. Pet Jan 29. Bristol, Feb 14. Sol Nash, Bristol.

Watson, William Thomas, 3 Warburton-rd., South, London Fields, Hackney, Middlesex, Dairyman. Pet Jan 29. London, Feb 23. Sols Lewis & Son, 7 Wilmingdon-sq., London.

Wheateley, John, Clarendon Inn, Clarendon-st., Leamington Priory, Innkeeper and Farmer. Pet Jan 29. Warwick, Feb 11. Sol Griffin, Leamington Priory.

Whitehead, James, Wolverhampton-rd., Sedgely, Staffordshire, Dealer in British Wines. Pet Jan 27. Dudley, Feb 11. Sol Maltry, Dudley.

Williams, John, Mill-st., Aberdeen, Builder. Pet Jan 21 (in form pauperis). Cardiff, Feb 11. Sol Ensor, Cardiff.

Wright, William Atkinson, Leeds, Milliner. Pet Jan 27. Leeds, Feb 20. Sol Harle.

TUESDAY, Feb 12, 1862.

Ainsworth, John, 4 Hope-st., Ashton Old-rd., Greenrocer. Pet Jan 28. Manchester, Feb 27. Sol Stringer, Manchester.

Amis, Samuel, 23 and 24 St. Andrews-st., Bury St. Edmunds, and Friars-lane, King-ct., Great Yarmouth, Fish Merchant. Pet Feb 1. London, Feb 12. Sols Nichols & Clark, 9 Cook's-court, Lincoln's-inn.

Balshaw, Richard, St. Helen's, Lancashire, Builder. Pet Jan 29. Liverpool, Feb 17. Sol Duke, Liverpool.

Barnes, Charles, 3 Grosvenor-ter, Newton Heath, near Manchester, Commercial Traveller. Pet Jan 29. Manchester, Feb 25. Sol Ambler, Manchester.

Bauwens, Felix Lievin, 22 Little Queen-st. and 15 Saint Ann-st., Westminster, Candle and Soap Maker. Pet Jan 31 (in form pauperis). London, Feb 14. Sol Graves, 5 Gray's-inn place.

Bayliss, John, 4 Nylam-bldgs, Southwark, Surrey, Attorney's Clerk. Pet Feb 3. London, Feb 19. Sol Holt, Quality-court.

Bickerdike, George, 7 Rotherfield-ct., Lower-rd., Islington, Middlesex, Gas Engineer. Pet Feb 1 (in form pauperis). London, Feb 18. Sol Holt, Quality-ct., Chancery-lane.

Blakeway, Richard Burton, Heathton, Claverly, Salop, Farmer. Pet Jan 31. Birmingham, Feb 19. Sols Saunders & Son, Kidderminster, and James & Knight, Birmingham.

Boothman, Charles, jun, 32 Trafford-st., Hulme, Manchester, Builder. Pet Jan 29. Salford, Feb 15. Sol Lamb, Manchester.

Boothman, Charles, jun, 16 Waterloo-grove, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Builder. Pet Jan 29. Manchester, Feb 23. Sol Lamb, Manchester.

Borne, Henry Charles Doncaster, Boston, Grocer. Pet Jan 30. Nottingham, Feb 20. Sols Brown & Son, Lincoln.

Broadfield, Edward Holloway, Stourport, Grocer. Pet Jan 31. Kidderminster, Feb 20. Sol Boycott, Kidderminster.

Brown, Matthew, jun., 8 Hope-st, York, Grocer. Pet Jan 31. York, Feb 17. Sol Mann, York.

Budd, Benjamin, Tyler's-green, Chepping Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, Timber Dealer. Pet Feb 1. High Wycombe, Feb 17. Sol Spicer, Great Marlow.

Bukhsh, Kadir, 35 Whitcross-place, Finsbury, Middlesex, Turkish Bath Man. Pet Jan 30 (in forma pauperis). London, Feb 18. Sol Sorrell, 19 Mark-lane.

Butler, John Eastington, 24 Pontmorialis, Merthyr Tydfil, Wire Worker. Pet Jan 31. Merthyr Tydfil, Feb 17. Sol Forwood, Merthyr Tydfil.

Butler, Thomas, sen., Rosefield House, Smethwick, Breeze Dealer. Pet Jan 29. Oldbury, Feb 18. Sol Parry, Birmingham.

Carratt, William Edward, Sixhills, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Pet Jan 29. Kingston-upon-Hull, Feb 19. Sol Brown, Lincoln.

Challenger, Joseph Henry, (and not John Henry as previously advertised).

Church, Daniel, 3 Osborne-villas, Peckham-rye, Surrey, Merchant's Clerk. Pet Jan 31. London, Feb 19. Sol Aubyn, 38 Moorgate-st.

Cooke, Richard, Millbrook-road, Freamstons, Hants, Tin Plate Worker. Pet Jan 27. London, Feb 18. Sol Hickman, Southampton.

Copper, William, Silver-st, Ely, Bricklayer. Pet Jan 31. Ely, Feb 20. Sol Cross, Ely.

Dams, William, Leicester, Tobacconist. Pet Jan 29. Leicester, Feb 15. Sol Weston, Leicester.

Davies, Benjamin, Old Lion Inn, King-st, Pembroke, Innkeeper. Pet Jan 29. Pembroke, Feb 17. Sol James, Haverfordwest.

Davies, Benjamin, Three Bells Inn, Tenby, Innkeeper. Jan 13. Haverfordwest, Feb 17. Sol Parry, Pembroke Dock.

Davis, James, 4 Tabernacle-walk, Finsbury, Middlesex. Pet Jan 31. London, Feb 14. Sol Nash, 12 Haberdasher-pl East, Hoxton.

Dolby, William Ashton, Syston, Kesteven, Lincolnshire, Land Agent. Pet Dec 19. Nottingham, Feb 20. Sol Reeves, Nottingham.

Drury, George William Brown, Preston, Surveyor. Pet Jan 30. Manchester, Feb 14. Sol Whitworth.

Eastwood, James, St James-st, Baup, Lancashire, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Jan 31. Manchester, Feb 18. Sol Whitehead, Rochdale.

Elkins, Luke James, Beckington, Carpenter. Pet Jan 30. Frome, Feb 18. Sol Dartmum, Frome.

Ekstedt, Thomas James, 3 High-st, Newington, Surrey, Piano-forte Manufacturer. Pet Feb 1. London, Feb 19. Sol Cordwell, 23 College-hill.

Evans, Edward, Cymdur Factory, Llywel, Breconshire, Wood Manufacturer. Jan 31. Brecknock, Feb 17. Sol Forwood, Merthyr Tydfil.

Evans, Thomas, sen, New Mill, Darowen, Montgomeryshire. Pet Jan 28. Newtown, April 2. Sol Duke, Birmingham.

Eveson, David, 48 Lee Bank-rd, Birmingham, Haberdasher. Pet Feb 1. Birmingham, Feb 14. Sol Duke, Birmingham.

Finney, Samuel, Mill-st, Leek, Staffordshire, Innkeeper. Pet Jan 31. Birmingham, Feb 17. Sols Challinor, Leek, and James & Knight, Birmingham.

Freeston, Humphrey May, Combe-grove, Mockton-grove, Somersetshire, Retired Commander in Her Majesty's Navy. Pet Jan 30. Bristol, Feb 17. Sols Slack & Simmons, Bath, and Abbott, Lucas, & Leonard, Bristol.

Garrington, Danzie Sawkins Hawkins, Burnham, Essex, Sail Maker. Pet Jan 31. Maldon, Feb 20. Sol Digby, Maldon.

Hall, William Henry, Uffington, Berks, Grocer. Pet Jan 24. Farringdon, Feb 13. Sol Jotchan, Wantage.

Hanson, Alfred, Hagworthingham, Farmer, and John James Sumner, Conisburgh, Miller and Baker. Pet Jan 30. Horncastle, Feb 13. Sol Brockebury, Alford.

Harrison, Charles, Brigewater-st, Runcorn, Provision Dealer. Pet Jan 22. Runcorn, Feb 19. Sol Bant, Manchester.

Hinks, Henry, Bloesier, Corn Merchant. Pet Feb 3. London, Feb 20. Sol Rae, 18, Warwick-st, Gray's-inn.

Holder, Heuben, St. Stephen's-st, Norwich, Dealer in Toys. Pet Jan 30. Norwich, Feb 17. Sol Bailey, Norwich.

Horrocks, Richard, Vauxhall-rd, Scholes, Wigan, Flour Dealer. Pet Jan 9. Lancaster, Feb 27. Sol Rawlinson, Lancaster.

Hoskin, William Henry, 5 York-st, Plymouth. Pet Feb 1. East Stonehouse, Feb 19. Sols Edworthy, Caris, & Dawe, Plymouth.

Houlsworth, Joseph, Egerton-rd, Fenney-st, Higher Broughton, Lancashire, Printer. Pet Feb 1. Manchester, Feb 15. Sols E. & W. Mann, Manchester.

Hughes, Robert, 2 Bridge-st, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Grocer. Pet Jan 30. Newcastle-under-Lyme, Feb 13. Sol Litchfield.

Hull, William, Liverpool, Miller. Pet Jan 31. Liverpool, Feb 17. Sols Evans, Son, & Sandys, Liverpool.

Jackson, John, 6 Percy-st, Kingston-upon-Hull. Pet Jan 30. Kingston-upon-Hull, Feb 13. Sol Summers, Hull.

Jagger, John, North Bridge-end, Halifax, Hand Loom Weaver. Pet Jan 31. Halifax, Feb 21. Sol Jobb, Halifax.

James, Eli, Swansea, Bill Broker. Pet Jan 24. Bristol, Feb 14. Sols Clark, Fissell, & Prichard, Bristol.

Jeffries, George, Alton, Staffordshire, Cordwainer. Pet Jan 28. Cheadle, Feb 14. Sol Litchfield.

Johnson, Parnell, Market Rasen, Lincolnshire, Cabinet Maker. Pet Feb 3. Kingston-upon-Hull, Feb 19. Sols Brown & Son, Lincoln.

Jones, Mary, Bryn-lan, Lancashire, Montgomery, Widow, Farmer. Pet Jan 29. Liverpool, Feb 12. Sols Evans, Son, & Sandys, Liverpool.

Kilridge, Hugh, Nelson-court, Bradford, Fruiterer. Pet Jan 30. Bradford, Feb 28. Sol Harris, Bradford.

Law, William, Birmingham, Brewer. Pet Feb 1. Birmingham, Feb 17. Sol Parry, Birmingham.

Leach, Peter, Ansoford, Somersetshire, formerly a Clerk of the Great Western Railway Company. Pet Jan 31. Wincanton, Feb 14. Sol Jillard, Wincanton.

Livesey, Thomas, Club-st, Bamber Bridge, Walton-le-Dale, Lancashire, Publican. Jan 14. Preston, Feb 13. Sol Darley, Preston.

Long, George, 15 Lower-st, Deal, Shoemaker. Jan 20. Maidstone, Feb 16. Sol Emmerson, Sandwich.

Matthews, William Edward, Birmingham, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Feb 1. Birmingham, Feb 21. Sol Suckling, Birmingham.

Moorehouse, Thomas, Kirkgate, Huddersfield. Pet Jan 28. Huddersfield, Feb 20. Sol Dransfield, Huddersfield.

Mumford, Thomas, Tame Bridge, West Bromwich, Beerhouse Keeper. Pet. Walsall, Feb 17. Sol Duignan, Walsall.

Myers, Joseph, 2 Cumberland-pl, Old Kent-rd, Surrey, Furniture Dealer. Pet Jan 30. London, Feb 19. Sol Solomon, Finsbury-pl.

Newman, George Arthur, 6 Machiborough-rd, Chelsea, Middlesex, Marine Store Dealer. Pet Jan 31. London, Feb 23. Sols Elcum & Hoombe, 13 Bedford-row.

Noakes, Henry, Roe Buck-lane, St. Margaret's, Rochester, Market Gardener. Pet Jan 31. Rochester, Feb 18. Sol Morgan, Maidstone.

Norris, Nathaniel Derry, Hereford, Corn Merchant. Pet Jan 29. Birmingham, Feb 17. Sol Suckling, Birmingham.

Outram, William, Masbrough, near Rotherham, Carpenter. Pet Jan 28. Rotherham, Feb 21. Sol Benney, Sheffield.

Pearson, Edmund, 70 Edward-st, Manchester, Commission Agent. Pet Jan 31. Manchester, Feb 27. Sol Stiles, Manchester.

Phillips, William, Paul's-row, Truro, Mine Broker. Pet Jan 29. Truro, Feb 12. Sol Marshall.

Philpot, Thomas, Shrewsbury, Innkeeper. Pet Jan 22. Birmingham, Feb 17. Sols Edwards, Shrewsbury, and James & Knight, Birmingham.

Pipe, William, Framlingham, Suffolk, Butcher. Pet Jan 31. London, Feb 18. Sols Moseley, Taylor, & Moseley, 9 Old Jewry-chambers, for Moseley & Massey, Framlingham.

Potter, James Jordan, Green-lane, Walsall, Slater. Pet. Walsall, Feb 17. Sol Duignan, Walsall.

Powers, William, Spon-lane, Westbromwich, Stock-taker at Ironworks. Pet Jan 30. Oldbury, Feb 18. Sol Shakespeare, Oldbury.

Price, Theophilus, 187 Schoolfield-st, Nethesda, Birmingham, Die Sinker. Pet Jan 30. Birmingham, March 31. Sol Powell, Birmingham.

Pyefinch, Joseph West, 25 East-st, Walworth, Surrey, Cheesemonger. Pet Feb 1. London, Feb 25. Sol Beard, Basinghall-st.

Richardson, James, Cranfield, Bedfordshire, Baker. Pet Jan 30. Amptill, Feb 17. Sol Scinson, Bedford.

Rice, Charles, 11 Black Prince-rd, Walsworth-rd, Surrey, Oilman. Pet Feb 1. London, Feb 25. Sol East, 29 Bedford-row.

Roberts, William, Naughton, Suffolk, Wheelwright. Pet Feb 1. London, Feb 20. Sols Keighley & Gething, 7 Ironmonger-lane.

Robinson, Thomas, Main-st, Cockermouth, Innkeeper. Pet Jan 30. Cockermouth, Feb 15. Sol Hayton, Cockermouth.

Rowley, George, 8 Shaftesbury-st, New North-rd, Islington, Middlesex, Oil and Colourman. Pet Jan 30. London, Feb 14. Sol Layton, jun, 9 Chesham-rd, Upper-st, Islington.

Salvago, Pantaloe, 11 Constance, 31 Broad-st, London, and Manchester Merchant. Pet Feb 1. London, Feb 19. Sols Crowder, Maynard, & Co., Coleman-st.

Sansan, James, Newark-upon-Trent, Coal Dealer. Pet Feb 1. Newark, Feb 21. Sol Ashley, Newark-upon-Trent.

Selby, William, Melton Mowbray, Tailor. Pet Jan 31. Melton Mowbray, Feb 17. Sol Latham, Melton Mowbray.

Sharpley, William Henry, Commercial-chambers, Ridings-st, Manchester, Yarn Agent. Pet Feb 1. Manchester, Feb 15. Sol Richardson, Manchester.

Shaw, John, Spittlegate, Grantham, Felimonogr. Pet Jan 29. Grantham, Feb 11. Sol Mallin, Grantham.

Shepherd, William, Berry Edge, Durham, Builder. Jan 15. Durham, Feb 19.

Skellott, Daniel, Oldbury-green, Oldbury, Worcestershire, Fishmonger. Pet Jan 31. Oldbury, Feb 18. Sol Shakespeare, Oldbury.

Simn, Isaac, Fairfield View, Edge-lane, near Liverpool, Coal Merchant. Pet Feb 1. Liverpool, Sol Anderson & Cottens, Liverpool.

Simmons, William, Higham Ferrers, Northamptonshire, Butcher. Pet Jan 30. Northampton, Feb 13. Sol White, Northampton.

Slater, James, 25 Brownlow-rd, Queen's-rd, Dalton, Middlesex, Warehouseman. Pet Jan 29. London, Feb 14. Sol Silvester, 18, Gt. Dover-st.

Smith, Robert, sen., 72 College-st, Camden Town, Middlesex, Builder. Pet Jan 31. London, Feb 20. Sols Fenton & Son, Bevois-st, Basinghall-st.

Stammers, Henry Hammond, 201 Strand, Middlesex, Tailor. Pet Jan 31. London, Feb 30. Sols Harrison & Lewis, 6 Old Jewry.

Stone, Walter John, Mostyn-st, Llandudno, Carnarvonshire. Pet Feb 1. Liverpool, Sol Thornley.

Stratton, John George, 29 Haberdasher-st, Hoxton, Middlesex, Mining Agent. Pet Jan 30. London, Feb 18. Sol Phipps, 20 Coleman-st.

Swainston, Edward, Darlington, Builder. Pet Jan 30. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Feb 14. Sol Story, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Thomas, Henry, Arundel-court Farm, Pipe and Lyde, Hereford, Farmer. Pet Feb 3. Birmingham, Feb 17. Sols Garrod, Hereford, and Wright, Birmingham.

Tomkins, William Henry, Rushall-st, Walsall, Printer. Pet Jan 30. Birmingham, Feb 14. Sol Glover, Walsall.

Turner, Charles, 23 Ilington-st, Salford, Foreman Linen Dresser. Pet Jan 29. Salford, Feb 15. Sol Lamb, Manchester.

Unsworth, Peter, 4 & 6 Borough-st, Fendleton, Lancashire, Hairdresser. Pet Feb 1. Salford, Feb 18. Sol Elcock, Manchester.

Vaughan, William, Boston, Wells, Somersetshire, Licensed Victualer. Pet Jan 31. Wells, Feb 14. Sol Reed, Bridgwater.

Walker, Thomas, Fenton, Staffordshire, Butty Collier. Pet Jan 30. Stoke-upon-Trent, Feb 15. Sol Litchfield.

Walton, Thomas James, 30 Great St. Helens, Blithburgh-st, London, Shipping Agent. Pet Jan 31. London, Feb 18. Sols Wild & Barber, 104 Ironmonger-lane.

West, Charles William, 26 Bourville-st, Fleet-st, London, Bookbinder. Pet Jan 30. London, Feb 29. Sol Hope, 9 Ely-pl, Holborn.

White, John, 3 Cheltenham-cottages, Willis-st, Hunter's-lane, Aston, Warwickshire, Accountant Clerk. Pet Jan 31. Birmingham, March 31. Sol East, Birmingham.

Whiteman, William, 37 Churton-st, Fimlico, Middlesex, Builder. Pet Feb 1. London, Feb 14. Sol Kent, Cannon-st.

Wilson, Edward, 2 Kirby-st, Poplar New Town, Middlesex, Ginger Beer Manufacturer. Pet Jan 28. London, Feb 20. Sol Biggendon, Walbrook.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, JAN. 31, 1862.

Fry, Thomas Felstead, 1 Percy-villas, Wells-st, Hackney, Middlesex, Clerk in Docks. Jan 23.

TUESDAY, FEB. 4, 1862.

Haworth, John, Stone Fold Mill, near Haslingden, Lancashire, Cotton Spinner. Jan 30.

TYLER AND COMPANY,

(Late GOODCHAP, TYLER, & Co.)

ACCOUNTANTS,

13, GRESHAM STREET, E.C.

During a practice of twenty years, T. & Co. have had great experience in winding up Joint Stock Companies in Chancery; the investigation of intricate and disputed accounts; the liquidation of estates under deeds of inspection, assignment, and composition; and the audit of the accounts of public companies.

The management of estates under the New Bankruptcy Act undertaken. Terms moderate.

UNITED KINGDOM LIFE ASSURANCE

COMPANY,
No. 8, WATERLOO PLACE, Pall Mall, LONDON, S.W.

The Hon. FRANCIS SCOTT, CHAIRMAN.
CHARLES BERWICK CURTIS, Esq., DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.

Fourth Division of Profits.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—Parties desirous of participating in the fourth division of profits to be declared on policies effected prior to the 31st of December, 1861, should make immediate application. There have already been three divisions of profits, and the bonuses divided have averaged nearly 2 per cent. per annum on the sums assured, or from 30 to 100 per cent. on the premiums paid, without the risk of co-partnership.

To show more clearly what these bonuses amount to, the three following cases are given as examples:

Sum Insured.	Bonuses added.	Amount payable up to Dec., 1854.
£5,000	£1,987 10	£6,987 10
1,000	375 10	1,375 10
100	39 15	139 15

Notwithstanding these large additions, the premiums are on the lowest scale compatible with security; in addition to which advantages, one-half of the premiums may, if desired, for the term of five years, remain unpaid at 5 per cent. interest, without security or deposit of the policy.

The assets of the Company at the 31st December, 1860, amounted to £730,665 7s. 10d., all of which had been invested in Government and other approved securities.

No charge for Volunteer Military Corps while serving in the United Kingdom.

Policy stamps paid by the office.

For prospectuses, &c., apply to the Resident Director, No. 8, Waterloo-place, Pall-mall.

By order, E. L. BOYD, Resident Director.

SOUTHAMPTON-BUILDINGS, No. 11.

MR. W. F. HAMMOND has to LET this capital PROFESSIONAL RESIDENCE, now just completing, being put into a thorough state of repair, with improvements, to be let to a solicitor's firm or in separate flats for chambers.

Auction and Estate Agency Offices, 3, Carey-street, opposite Lincoln's-inn-gateway, W.C.

CHEDDAR LOAF CHEESE, 6½d., 7½d., and 8½d.

per lb.

Ripe Stilton, 7d. to 1s. per lb.

Small Dantzic Tongues, 3s. 6d. per half dozen.

Prime Ox ditto, 2s. 3d. each, or three for 6s. 6d.

Osborne's Peat-smoked Breakfast Bacon is now in excellent cure, and Butters in perfection, at reasonable rates; other first-class Provisions equally moderate; packages gratis.

OSBORNE'S CHEESE WAREHOUSE,

Osborne House, 30, Ludgate-hill, near St. Paul's, E.C.

GLENFIELD PATENT STARCH,

USED IN THE ROYAL LAUNDRY.

THE LADIES are respectfully informed that this Starch is EXCLUSIVELY USED IN THE ROYAL LAUNDRY.

And HER MAJESTY'S LAUNDRESS says, that although she has tried WHEATEN, RICE, AND OTHER POWDER STARCHES,

she has found none of them equal to the GLENFIELD, which is THE FINEST STARCH SHE EVER USED.

WHEN YOU ASK FOR

GLENFIELD PATENT STARCH,

See that you get it, as inferior kinds are often substituted.

WOTHERSPOON & Co., GLASGOW AND LONDON.

SIR W. BURNETT, Director-General of the Medical

Department of the Navy, recommended BORWICK'S BAKING POWDER in preference to every other, for the use of Her Majesty's Navy, because it was more wholesome—more effective—would keep longer—and was in all respects superior to every other manufactured. Pleading testimonials as to its superior excellence have also been received from the Queen's Private Baker; Dr. Hassall, Analyst to the *Lancet*; Captain Allen Young, of the Arctic yacht "Fox," and other scientific men. Sold everywhere in 1d., 2d., 4d., and 6d. packets; and 1s., 2s. 6d., and 5s. boxes.

When you ask for Borwick's Baking Powder, see that you get it, as complaints have been made of shopkeepers substituting worthless articles, made from inferior and inexpensive ingredients, because they are realising a larger profit by them.

JOHN GOSNELL & CO., PERFUMERS TO THE QUEEN,

beg to recommend the following Fashionable and Superior Articles for the TOILET to the special notice of all purchasers of Choice PERFUMERY.

John Gosnell & Co.'s JOCKEY CLUB PERFUME, in universal request as the most admired perfume for the handkerchief, price 2s. 6d.

John Gosnell & Co.'s LA NOBLESSE PERFUME—a most delicate perfume of exquisite fragrance.

John Gosnell & Co.'s GARIBALDI BOUQUET—a most choice and fashionable perfume.

John Gosnell & Co.'s RUSSIAN LEATHER PERFUME—a very fashionable and agreeable perfume.

John Gosnell & Co.'s BALL-ROOM COMPANION or FOUNTAIN PERFUMES. Elegant Novelties, in the form of Portable Handkerchief Perfumes in a neat case, which emits on pressure a jet of most refreshing perfume. Price 1s. and 1s. 6d. each.

John Gosnell & Co.'s LA NOBLESSE POMADE—elegantly perfumed, and highly recommended for beautifying and promoting the growth of Hair.

John Gosnell & Co.'s GOLDEN OIL—Molline—Macassar Oil—Bears' rease, &c., for the Hair.

John Gosnell & Co.'s CHERRY TOOTH PASTE is greatly superior to any Tooth Powder, gives the Teeth a pearl-like whiteness, protects the enamel from decay, and imparts a pleasing fragrance to the breath.

John Gosnell & Co.'s AMBROSIAL SHAVING CREAM, 1s. and 1s. 6d. in pots; also, in compressible tubes, for the convenience of persons travelling, price 1s.

John Gosnell & Co.'s INSTANTANEOUS HAIR DYE—The only Hair Dye which produces a good natural colour with perfect certainty, and with the least possible trouble.

Manufactory, 12, Three King-court, Lombard-street, London.

KAMPTULICON OR ELASTIC FLOOR CLOTH,

as made by GOUGH & BOYCE, the Original Patentees, and laid exclusively by them at the Houses of Parliament, and numerous other Public Offices. It is especially adapted for Churches, Mansions, Public Rooms, Shops, and Passages, being clean, warm, noiseless, dry, and economical.

GOUGH & BOYCE, 12, Bush-lane, Cannon-street, London. Forwarded to all parts of the Country.

TRELOAR'S CORK FLOOR CLOTH, or KAMP-

TULICON, COCOA NUT MATTING, and DOOR MATS. Best quality and moderate prices.

T. TRELOAR, Manufacturer, 43, Ludgate-hill, London.

KAMPTULICON or PATENT INDIA-RUBBER

AND CORK FLOORCLOTH. Warm, noiseless, and impervious to damp, as supplied to the Houses of Parliament, British Museum, Windsor Castle, Buckingham Palace, and numerous public and private offices.

F. G. TRESTRAIL & Co., 19 & 20, Walbrook, London, E.C.

Manufactory—South London Works, Lambeth.

COAL.—The GUINEA COAL COMPANY'S

WALLEND'S all the year round, can only be obtained by addressing to the Secretary, MR. JAMES JENNINGS, 7, York-road, King's-cross Station, N. Coke, 18s.

ALBION SNELL, Watchmaker and Jeweller, has

removed to his New Premises, 114, High Holborn, seven doors east of King-street, where he respectfully solicits an inspection of his new and well-selected stock.

A WONDERFUL LIGHT.—The most brilliant

and economical artificial light known is obtained from the STELLA LAMP. No smoke! No smoke! No danger! During 12 consecutive hours the cost from one penny. The secret of success arises from perfect combustion. If you do not use gas, by all means put away candles, and adopt the STELLA LAMP. Price 1s. 3d. to 3 guineas; office lamps from 2s. 6d.

Depot, No 11, Oxford-street, adjoining the Star Brewery.

60,000 DEATHS OCCUR EVERY YEAR IN ENGLAND AND WALES BY CONSUMPTION ALONE.

OZONIZED COD LIVER OIL has been proved,

at the Hospital for Consumption, Brompton, London, to be the nearest approach to a specific yet found for this fatal disease. The pulse is lowered, a far more generous diet may be taken, and the general health thereby unmitigatedly proved. See *Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society's Transactions*, Vol. 42, for 1859; *Lancet*, July 9, 1859; *Pharmaceutical Journal*, August 1, 1859, &c.

Prepared only by G. BOAWICK, Sole Licensee, 21, Little Moorfields, London. Sold in 2s. 6d., 4s. 9d., and 9s. Bottles, by all Druggists.

HOLLOWAY'S OINTMENT AND PILLS.—

Admired Remedies.—Sores, ulcers, wounds, and scrofulous blemishes may be thoroughly and permanently removed by Holloway's world-esteemed Ointment and Pills. Mrs. Jackson, of 17, Upper Brook-street, Derby, records the case of her wrist, which had been for twenty years most painfully afflicted by a scrofulous ulcer for which she had sought surgical assistance in vain. Bad legs, varicose veins, swelled ankles, and erysipelas, also yield to the judicious use of Holloway's cooling, healing, and purifying preparations which generally give ease on their first application. However painful the affection may feel, however terrible the sore may seem, the sufferer may be cheered by the knowledge that these remedies have cured as bad if not worse cases.

